

# THE STUDENT WORLD

---

**UT OMNES UNUM SINT**

Ecumenical Encounter in India

---

**SECOND QUARTER 1953**

# THE STUDENT WORLD

Serial Number 180

## Ecumenical Encounter in India

		Page
Ecumenical Encounter in India	Ph. M.	97
A Message from the Chairman	D. T. Niles	101
Our More than Human Fellowship	Robert C. Machie	105
The Crucified and Risen Christ	Martin Niemöller	111
Witnessing in the University Communities	Philippe Maury	120
Ambassadors for Christ	Tsunegoro Nara	131
A Redeemed Life	M. M. Thomas	135
Evangelism — The Gospel to the Whole Man	Peter Kreyssig	143
The Christian in the University	Philip Lee-Woolf	152
Church and Mission	Valdo Galland	157
The Student World Chronicle		
Kottayam Impressions — Statements from American, Orthodox and Latin American Delegates to the World Conference of Christian Youth		168
Student Dilemmas		
In Rural Asia	Mathai Zachariah	173
In the Newly-independent Countries of Asia	Leo Radja Haba	176
In Colonial Africa	Bola Ige	178
In Communist-dominated Countries — China	Philip Lee-Woolf	181
The Impact of Military Life	William Stringfellow	182
In French Universities	Georges Craspy	186
Letters to the Editor	Margaret Ford	188
	Brian Harvey	192
An Asian Travel Diary	Marie-Jeanne de Haller	194
Book Reviews		
Vision and Action: The Problems of Ecumenism	R. H. S. Boyd	199
The Courage To Be	Robert B. Tillman	201
D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence	George Every, S. S. M.	204
Ecumenical Foundations	Leila Giles	205

*This issue of "The Student World" was published in Geneva, Switzerland. Four issues annually. The price of a single annual subscription, post free, is 8.50 Swiss francs; 10s.; \$2.00. Single copies, 2.50 Swiss francs; 2s. 6d.; \$0.75. A "Friend of the Federation" who subscribes a minimum of 17,— Swiss francs, £1., or \$5.00 is entitled to receive "The Student World" and the "Federation News Sheet" (bi-monthly). Subscriptions may be sent to any of the addresses given below:*

Australia:	Student Christian Movement, 182, Collins Street, Melbourne, C. 1., Victoria.
Canada:	Student Christian Movement, 143, Bloor Street West, Toronto 5, Ont.
China:	Kiang Wen-han, Y.M.C.A., 131, Museum Road, Shanghai.
Great Britain and Ireland:	Miss Dorothy Jackson, Annandale, Golders Green, London, N. W. 11.
India, Pakistan and Ceylon:	C. S. Paul, Spencecroft, 7a Tannery Road, Bangalore 1.
Netherlands:	N.C.S.V., "Wondschoten", Zeist.
New Zealand:	Student Christian Movement, P.O. Box 742, Wellington, C. I.
South Africa:	F. J. Liebenberg, P.O. Box 25, Stellenbosch, Cape Province.
Sweden:	Vera Gudmundsson, Gyllenkroksgallé 7, Lund.
U.S.A.:	United Student Christian Council, c/o Mrs. Claire Ziver, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

or to the general offices of the World's Student Christian Federation, 13, rue Calvin, Geneva, Switzerland (Postal Cheque Account No. 1. 31 92).



# THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva  
by the World's Student Christian Federation

PHILIPPE MAURY, *Editor*

---

VOLUME XLVI

Second Quarter, 1953

NUMBER 2

---

## ECUMENICAL ENCOUNTER IN INDIA

Several hundred Christian young people from many parts of the world, and from various churches and Christian youth organizations, were the guests of India during December, 1952, and January, 1953. The World's Student Christian Federation itself was directly responsible for three of the numerous international conferences held there during this period, when so many visitors came to know something of the life of Asian Christendom. Together with the World Council of Churches, the World Council of Christian Education and Sunday School Association, the World's Alliance of Y.M.C.A.s and the World's Y.W.C.A., it had called the third World Conference of Christian Youth which met in Kottayam, one of the cities of Travancore, in that extreme southern tip of the Indian peninsula where Christianity has been established since the first centuries of our era. Some four hundred participants gathered together for two weeks to study, under the theme, "Christ the Answer", the Christian responsibility of young people in our time. Lectures were delivered, discussion groups met, Bible study was done, and, above all, a great effort was made to provide a direct encounter between the delegates and the local churches in all their great confessional variety. It was the unanimous feeling at Kottayam that the highlight of the conference was that second Sunday on which all delegates, either singly or in small teams, visited neighbouring parishes, speaking, preaching, and meeting and sharing in the real life of Indian Christians.

It is impossible to adequately describe such an experience. However, we hope that all those who wish to have a true understanding of what Kottayam meant for its participants and of the contribution it can bring to all Christians around the world, will read the report of the conference which is now available<sup>1</sup>. In this issue of *The Student World* you will find a summary of a speech delivered at Kottayam by Pastor Martin Niemöller, and some statements which came from several national delegations at the close of the conference.

At the end of the year a Federation conference met at Madras Christian College in the wonderful park of Tambaram. It was intended primarily as a meeting place for members of the S.C.M. of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, and other Federation members, around the major concerns of students. There was a relatively light program, since most of the delegates had just attended other meetings, or were going to take part in subsequent ones. Some of the major addresses delivered at Tambaram are reproduced in full or summary form in this issue of *The Student World*.

By far the most important meeting for the life of the Federation was the session of the General Committee which met from January 9 to 21 at the Nasrapur Spiritual Life Centre near Poona in the Bombay area. Representatives from thirty-one countries met together before God to prepare the program of activities of the Federation for the next three years. New Officers and Executive Committee members were elected, and I am happy to tell you that for the first time in its history the Federation is under the chairmanship of an Asian, D. T. Niles of Ceylon, well known in ecumenical circles for his activities in the Methodist Church and in the Y.M.C.A., and recently appointed to the staff of the World Council of Churches as Secretary of the Department of Evangelism. A message from him to the Federation is included in this number of *The Student World*. I shall continue to serve as General Secretary and editor of *The Student World* for the coming three years, and I am most happy to welcome as Associate General Secretary

<sup>1</sup> *Footprints in Travancore*, a report of the World Conference of Christian Youth, held in Kottayam, Travancore, December 11 to 25, 1952.



Kyaw Than of Burma, who has been on the staff of the Federation since 1950. Valdo Galland of Uruguay will continue to work in Latin America, and Leila Giles of Australia will begin her work on the staff in July, 1953. The General Committee expressed its gratitude to all retiring Officers and members of staff: Robert Mackie, who ceases to be a Federation Officer after more than eighteen years of service, Ruth Wick, Leila Anderson, Kiang Wen-Han, M. M. Thomas, Hiel Bollinger, Marie-Jeanne de Haller, Keith Bridston and Harry Daniel.

But the major task of the General Committee was one of study and planning. It found inspiration for its work in several addresses, most of which are included here. Reports of the various Commissions and Sub-Committees will be published in full in the Minutes of the General Committee which are now available<sup>1</sup>, and important extracts will be included in coming numbers of *The Student World*.

It is still very difficult to set forth in a few words what was the major emphasis of these ecumenical meetings in India, and particularly of our General Committee. So much thinking was done, so many confrontations took place between differing confessional, theological and political viewpoints, that the main lines will only gradually become clear. For me personally at the present time their essence seems to be found in the theme chosen for a Federation consultation to take place early in 1954: "The Church and the World". We were told at Nasrapur that the Church is inextricably "bound up with the world", but has received a call from God to "a redeemed life" and to be an "ambassador for Christ" within that world. One of the major discussions took place around the meaning of the word "secular", and the sense in which the Church and the Student Christian Movement must be truly secular within a world which is secularized in a perverted way. Thus a strong emphasis was put on both the missionary nature of our task and the pressing need to carry it out, not in isolation from the world but through identification with it, in so far as we can do so without

<sup>1</sup> *Minutes of the Meeting of the General Committee of the W.S.C.F., Nasrapur, India, January 9 to 21, 1953.* Sw. frs. 4; 6s.; \$1.00.

losing the message which is our *raison d'être*. The expression, "going out of the ghetto", was used again and again.

The second major aspect of these meetings was, of course, the confrontation with India, with the tragedy of its material misery, and both the opportunities and frightening difficulties of Christian evangelism in the midst of reviving ancient religions. It was probably through informal conversations, walks in Indian villages or industrial suburbs, visits to Hindu temples, and discussions with students involved in the political life of Asia, that those who were visiting this old land made their greatest discoveries. As one of the delegates told me, "I had never understood, nor even imagined, though I had read many books about India, what a terrific responsibility lies on the Church in that country." I hope that this discovery, which was certainly shared by many of us, will ultimately lead to the more positive acceptance of the task to which we are all called. As one of the reports of our General Committee states it :

As we have met in this Asian setting we have been reminded that the local congregation is part of the Christian Church which in many parts of the world is a very small minority facing an overwhelming task. The need to declare the Gospel in its fulness in such situations calls for the resources of the whole Church. In practical terms this means that we must all be responsive to the need for men and women to serve in countries other than their own, both as laymen in government, commerce and international agencies, and in the varied full-time service of the churches. We have received fresh evidence that the churches and Student Christian Movements in Africa and Asia are eager to have the services of those who are prepared to respond in humility to the need and, working in fellowship with Christians facing new and challenging situations, to perform any task they may be called upon to undertake.

PH. M.



## A Message from the Chairman

D. T. NILES <sup>1</sup>

My assignment is that I seek to present my own beliefs, the beliefs by which I live, and, in so seeking to present them, to remember my audience described in the well-known phrase — the modern man. Who is a modern man and who is not? I have a vague uneasiness in my mind that by modern man is meant the large number of men and women who find religious belief either impossible or unnecessary, and for whom ethical conduct is determined by social convention. I read somewhere the story of a man who was raising for himself the problem of life. He began by asking this question: Why did Almighty God trouble to make me? Was it so that I should go to the cinema twice a week? There is nothing wrong in that but, as a reason for existence, it seems rather inadequate.

It seems to me, as I consider my own life, that the urgent question is: Why me at all? It is true that life imposes its own necessity to live and, perhaps, even to live well and to make of life a genuine work of art. But I have learned so much to distrust myself that I feel unhappy when the meaning of my life is a meaning that I have given to it.

I am married and have children, and my life in my home is satisfying because those who love me and those whom I love provide meaning for my life. In the same way I dare to believe that Jesus was right when He said that this world is our Father's home for us and that the meaning of our life is rooted in our Father's love for us and in our concern for one another as brethren. When men expect so little from life — food, shelter, the cinema, the pub, and the race course, and possibly a few test matches thrown in — then the question about God never arises. Belief in God makes sense only if life is lived in more heroic proportions.

<sup>1</sup> This message to the Federation from its newly-elected Chairman was originally written for a broadcast in Australia under the title "Plain Christianity".

As a minister of the Church, it is part of my privilege and responsibility to be in pastoral relation to many persons, and part of this pastoral task for a minister is the constant demand made on him to heal breaches in family life. Time and again husband or wife, or both, come with the problem of a broken home. There are always many reasons why some homes are not happy. But again and again it is obvious that the foundation problem is that people do not understand what it means to be loved. This is a characteristic of modern man. It is a characteristic of our age. We talk a great deal about the necessity to love and to care. We do so little to understand what it means to be loved and to be cared for. It hurts our pride and our sense of self-sufficiency.

I believe that God is Father, and by that I mean that I live by His love. Indeed, life would be insupportable if my sins were not forgiven. But I know that my Father forgives. The passion and death of Jesus have burned into my soul an understanding of what it means to be loved by God. There are in the poem, *The Everlasting Mercy*, by John Masefield, the following lines :

To get the whole world out of bed  
And washed and dressed, and warmed, and fed,  
To work, and back to bed again,  
Believe me, Saul, costs worlds of pain.

But, why worlds of pain ? Because they are all children loved by a Father. The story is told about a Spanish boy who said to his friends that he believed in Jesus because of that odd sparrow. And when questioned as to what he meant, he said : "When I go to the market I buy two sparrows for one coin, and for two coins I get four sparrows with one extra. Jesus has said that even that one odd sparrow is not forgotten by the Father in heaven. I am that odd sparrow." How true ! There is no-one so insignificant that Jesus does not know him and love him.

The problems for religious belief that are set for us by modern life, however, are not problems caused only by the way we have learned to live but also by the way we have learned



to think. Modern man prides himself on being scientific. He wants demonstrable proof, and religion seems to him to lie outside in the realm of the unproved and even of the superstitious. Perhaps it is an inevitable result of our technical civilization that we should look to the machine to set the pattern of our thought. We talk about the machinery of government but we never talk about the machinery of family life. In a home we are persons. In a state we are partly persons and partly just units in a queue and, somehow, we have come to believe that the whole world, indeed the whole universe, is a vast machine and that men and women are simply parts of it. I believe that the machine is the inevitable creation of selfish man. But man's destiny is not controlled by a world machine but by a Divine Father. The uniformity of nature is not an attribute of nature. It is a result of the constancy of God. This is an open universe, not a closed machine.

What do I mean by an open universe? I mean that it is open to direct intercourse between God and man, that the law of cause and effect is not an impersonal law. It is a law that governs the relationship between ponderables as well as imponderables. Mind and spirit are also governed by the law of causation. Love is the cause of forgiveness. Forgiveness is the cause of gratitude. Gratitude is the cause of worth-while living, and so on. Prayer is the religious practice that is grounded on this belief in an open universe. My most lasting childhood memory is that of my father on his knees. That he knelt down to pray with us was one thing; that in going to his bedroom unexpectedly I saw him on his knees when he was alone made quite a different impression. Prayer was not merely something which he was teaching us, it was something he did. So we not only learned to pray, we learned to believe in prayer.

Let me summarize what I have stated so far. First of all, I believe that my life has meaning because God made me and God forgives me. Secondly, I believe that this meaning of my life is rooted in the experience of being loved — by God in Jesus Christ which is the primary reality, and by my fellow men which is the derivative reality. Thirdly, I believe that the kind of life I am supposed to live, and all men are supposed to live, is made possible by the fact that God's relationship to this

world is a personal relationship. This world is not a machine but a home. And fourthly, I believe that this personal relationship between God and man is developed within the life of prayer.

There is one last word which must be added. And it is this. The word "belief" has unfortunately come to mean "opinion" or "conviction". The truer meaning of the word "belief" is "commitment", and it is because belief is commitment that I am able to hold the beliefs that I have explained so far. Commitment demands that we apply the logic of love. Intellectual belief demands that we apply the logic of proof. In the case of intellectual belief, proof comes first. In the case of commitment, the proof is worked out by the consequences in life of that commitment. When a Christian says he believes in Christ, he does not mean that he holds certain convictions about Him. He means that he commits his life to Him. This is also the natural result of another truth, the truth that Jesus is never simply an object of belief. The greater truth is that He is subject and that it is we who are the object of His action. He acts, man responds. He calls and man answers. If Jesus were only object we might be able to leave Him alone. But since He is subject we have to accept the consequence that He does not leave us alone. He could not do otherwise.



# Our More than Human Fellowship

ROBERT C. MACKIE <sup>1</sup>

With the close of this General Committee meeting, I come to the end of an eighteen year period as an Officer of the Federation. I cannot help recalling my first W.S.C.F. conference exactly thirty years ago and all the friendships made and renewed down the years. Therefore I should like to remind you of a sentence from the Whitby Minutes of 1949: "Within the S.C.M. we have recognized a more than human fellowship across confessional boundaries, to which we are bound to bear witness as a fact, and as a gift of the Holy Spirit." The New Testament word for fellowship in that sense is *Koinonia*. This *Koinonia* constitutes the framework of the New Testament; it is at the heart of what we call the ecumenical movement; it is the precious element in the life of the Federation and it alone distinguishes any S.C.M. branch from other student societies.

I suggest that we study briefly the meaning of *Koinonia* in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Perhaps if we were to examine these passages in their context, we might learn something of the deep meaning of this "more than human fellowship".

## *Partnership in the Gospel*

In the first chapter at the fifth verse Paul says to the Philippians that he is "thankful for your partnership in the Gospel from the first day until now". Happily we have the story of that first day in Philippi in Acts 16. I think here especially of how Lydia, in verse fifteen, urged Paul and his friends: "Come to my house and stay. And she prevailed upon us." There had always been a happy partnership. But note that it was a partnership in the Gospel, really into the Gospel — for the furtherance of the Gospel. At the Kottayam Youth Conference one of the Syrian Jacobite delegates pressed for Gospel

<sup>1</sup> A summary of the closing address to the W.S.C.F. General Committee.

teams of young people to visit different areas in Asia. This is what "partnership in the Gospel" means. This is part of *Koinonia*.

Our World's Student Christian Federation is basically a fellowship in this sense. If you look at the aims in our Constitution, you will find a series of transitive verbs: "lead, deepen, influence, bring further". This positive, evangelistic purpose is primary in the Federation. It is this purpose which makes it a fellowship. Do not be misled by the relative importance of continental, national and confessional balances. They are all secondary. Careful adjustments do not make ecumenical fellowship. Only a consuming passion to bring men to Christ does that.

### *Partakers of grace*

A little later in this same chapter, at the seventh verse, Paul uses *Koinonia* again when he says: "I hold you all in my heart as partakers with me of grace." This "more than human fellowship" depends upon God's free gift of salvation in Christ. We do not achieve Christian fellowship. We cannot arrange human conditions so that it becomes inevitable. It is always the marvellous result of what God does for us all.

We have been accepting some Movements into full affiliation with the Federation, and others as "corresponding" Movements. We have found that we have no fixed plan of initiation, and that our standards are rather general, depending upon the assessment of a number of factors, some of them quite intangible. Perhaps we could improve upon our system. But even then no Movement will have the right to be a member of the Federation. Indeed none of our affiliated Movements today can take pride in being worthy of their privileges and responsibilities. For the only way into a truly Christian fellowship is the way of humility — the hope that God may use us for his great purpose in the student world.

It is interesting to see that Paul runs on to say: "both in my imprisonment and in the defense and confirmation of the Gospel." This sense of unity, of being partakers with him of grace may be strengthened by worldly misfortunes and



separations. I remember speaking to a little evangelical group in Slovakia in November, 1938, just after the infamous Munich compromise. At the end of my short Sunday morning address, an elderly man rose and said, "You seemed to be unhappy as you spoke, because of what your country has done to ours. You have no business to be unhappy here because you are in the Christian fellowship, where such factors do not count." Is it not in some such way that our fellowship with friends in China or Eastern Europe holds? Whether we can meet them or not, whatever be our estrangements from one another, we remain partakers with them of grace.

And at this meeting we have heard some glorious evidence of "the defense and confirmation of the Gospel". As Tsunegoro Nara spoke to us of evangelism in the prison camps of Siberia, as Tine Fransz reminded us of the high proportion of non-Christians in the Indonesian S.C.M., and as we heard of the progress being made in Latin American universities, we were caught up in a new sense of fellowship. We held them in our hearts as partakers with us of grace. We knew that we were in this work of Christ together.

### *Participation in the Spirit*

At the very beginning of the second chapter, Paul again uses this word, when he speaks of "participation in the spirit"; we are far too apt to think of the Holy Spirit in a vague way, whereas for Paul the presence of the Spirit was the most concrete factor in Christian fellowship. You can see this if you look at the verses which follow, where Paul speaks about "being of the same mind... of one mind". This is not sentiment; it is the focussing of all the faculties upon common interests. And Paul clinches his point by adding: "Have this mind among yourselves, which you have in Christ Jesus." Apparently it is the presence of the living Christ, or the participation of Christians in His Spirit, which is the final guarantee of a fellowship with a positive character to it.

This guarantee of fellowship is very easily lost. How many so-called Christian fellowships have ceased to be "participation in the Spirit". The shell remains but the content has dis-

appeared. That is why we have tried to spend periods in prayer, meditation and intercession at this meeting. Worship is not a decorative addition to a Christian committee ; it is its primary sphere of operation. Perhaps some of you have been helped in your own prayer-life, as I have, in these times together. As students we rather revel in the struggle to find a common mind on great issues. But remember that the basis for unity in such matters is not the compromise that rises out of discussion by itself, but the acceptance of a new position for us all within the framework of prayer, or, as Paul would have said, in Christ.

### *Sharing in sufferings*

It is all too easy to miss Paul's use of *Koinonia* in the third chapter. It comes in the tenth verse, where he speaks of his great aim "that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and may share his sufferings, becoming like him in his death". Here we are sharply reminded that Christian fellowship has the Cross at its centre. The power of the resurrection which gives the Christian community its character and purpose, stems from the Cross. In this whole passage Paul shows us clearly how it was only through abasement, through the loss of all things, that he gained Christ. He is saying to the Christians in Philippi that fellowship with Christ in his sufferings is essential to real Christian fellowship with one another.

Sometimes we think of the success of the Federation in the student world. Certainly there have been great days and great achievements since John R. Mott launched us on this venture fifty-eight years ago. But the Committee on the Survey of Movements has reminded us once again of the great weaknesses in our world-wide witness — the Movements which don't exist or which scarcely exist. And we are all of us conscious, at the end of this meeting, of the limitations and failures of the Movements we represent. There is a right way of handling our weakness — that of offering it to God as it is and asking Him to make His strength perfect through our Movements as they are. But there is another way, into which we often fall, that of resenting our lack of success and being jealous of other



Movements which seem to get in ahead of us. That kind of pride God cannot use, because it is a refusal to share in the sufferings of Christ.

Every General Committee of the Federation reminds us how different we are from one another, not only in our ways of thinking, but in our ways of discussing. There have been difficult moments in the last two weeks, when we have found other people wrong-headed but, worst of all, apparently unwilling to accept our arguments! And there have been absent voices which would have been even more difficult to listen to and to answer, if they had been present. A common mind amongst Christians is very hard to achieve, but the only way towards it is the way of suffering with and for one another. Indignation or superiority will take us nowhere. "Sharing in his sufferings" brings us closer and closer to one another.

### *Partnership in giving and receiving*

Paul always becomes practical at the end of his epistles. Essentially he wished his readers or listeners to act. So you find him using *Koinonia* in a very prosaic way in the fifteenth verse of the fourth chapter. He speaks of "partnership with me in giving and receiving". There is nothing falsely "spiritual" in this reference; the subject is the report of the Finance Committee! The Philippians had contributed their share, and this letter has the nature of a receipt. Yet this too is action which is part of true Christian fellowship. It is an essential manifestation of that fellowship.

Giving and receiving remain real problems for us. On the one hand we do not give enough to make this work of ours effective; on the other hand, as we have seen at this meeting, receiving also can be difficult. The world has invaded our Christian fellowship at both points. Giving is not easy because we are really preoccupied with our own interests or influence. Receiving is not easy because we are afraid of losing our independence. Yet this "partnership in giving and receiving" is essential for the health of the Federation and for the carrying out of the great purpose we have undertaken. Paul makes this very clear. All must give, and all must receive. Selfishness

and pride must not prevent the growth of Christian fellowship. And the key to the selflessness and humility we need is in the assurance: "My God will supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus." We are all beggars and therefore *Koinonia* is possible for us.

"To our God and Father be glory for ever and ever. Amen.'



# The Crucified and Risen Christ

MARTIN NIEMÖLLER <sup>1</sup>

St. Paul's message to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews was, according to his own testimony in I Corinthians, chapter 1, centred in the "preaching of the Cross". He points out that the decision which separates "them that perish" from "us which are saved" is marked by man's response to what happened when Jesus of Nazareth was put on the Cross. To the one group this message was sheer "foolishness", whereas "unto us which are saved it is the power of God".

It is obvious then that the "preaching of the Cross" or the "word of the Cross" means something more than just giving information about the end of the earthly life of the man and prophet of Nazareth. Such information in itself is nothing but the recording of an event, an historical fact. In itself it is neither "foolish" nor "powerful"; when we listen to the account of such an event we may be moved to pity and compassion, or to awe and disgust, but not to a decision of any kind, for we are not confronted with a problem which requires an answer from us.

As far back through the centuries as we can trace human history, people have been put to death as criminals, and many errors have been made in judging their guilt; many have fallen victims to what we call justice, and the case of Jesus may have been just one more mistake which demonstrates how imperfect and erroneous our human judgment always is. Two or three years ago we read in the papers that in the State of Israel the question was being considered whether they could take up again the lawsuit against Jesus in order to correct the sentence, and that the suggestion was dropped because of the question of competence. Certainly such a procedure would have meant nothing as to the "preaching of the Cross".

<sup>1</sup> Summary of an address delivered to the World Conference of Christian Youth at Kottayam.

This preaching of St. Paul and the other apostles always includes the proclamation of the crucified man, named Jesus, as the Christ of God, who was raised from the dead and who is the living Lord, demanding the humble surrender and the faithful loyalty of those to whom the message is brought. Here then, we are faced with a decision — either to accept Him or to reject Him ; here the question is put — and requires an answer. Do we believe that the man Jesus, who died upon the Cross as a criminal, who was a victim of human injustice, who died the death of a martyr for His convictions, who certainly earned and deserves our pity and compassion — do we believe that He is not one among many, but that He is the One, the only One, the Christ and the Son of God through whom we are saved and in whom accordingly we put our trust ?

In other words : are we here confronted with God Himself acting on our behalf and in such a way that we are forced to respond to His action ? Are we here at the crossroads where the one decision which really matters must be made ?

### *One among many ?*

I have seen many people die a shameful death on the gallows and behind the barbed wire, hung or shot without a real cause, innocent victims of human injustice, arbitrariness and cruelty. And we have all seen the misery of mankind which grips our hearts and arouses our powerless wrath and the poignant feeling of frustration. Do not experiences of this kind raise in our hearts the question of whether or not the death of Jesus belongs to the universal tragedy of mankind, from which there is no escape, which it is everyone's unavoidable fate to bear ? The scene on Calvary, is it more, can it be more than just one such event among millions and millions ? I admit quite simply that seeing people suffer and die by the thousands like cattle and worse than cattle, has been over and over again a severe temptation for my Christian faith, and I think that in some way we have all known this. Moreover, I am convinced that our faith needs this temptation to prevent it from becoming shallow and unrealistic, and from vanishing in the end like the religious phantom of our own making which many antagonists call it.

We can surely say that Jesus is not just one case among many, for He is the Son of God and that makes all the difference ! And Jesus Himself rightly interpreted His death when He said that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son". But this is not the message as it was proclaimed to an unbelieving world, and it is not the message which Jesus gave to His disciples in the beginning. He lived His life among them as the Son of Man, and when they began to recognize him as the Christ, the Son of God, He forbade them to tell it until after His death and resurrection. And even then the apostles began their preaching with the story of the Son of Man who in the end was crucified, and then only did they proclaim Him as the risen Christ, the living Lord of all. And when Peter preached about Him on Pentecost, he told the story of His suffering and death, and then he continued : "... whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death : because it was not possible — not possible — that he should be holden of it."

### *The first true man*

The story of the man Jesus is a challenging story ; here we are all without exception faced in a unique way with the holy God. For here we are confronted with a human being who bears the image of God undefiled, with a man who — unlike all of us — is at peace with God and with His fellowmen, who in perfect obedience does what God wants Him to do, "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross". He not only fulfils the great commandment ; He lives loving God with all His heart, with all His soul, with all His mind, and loving His neighbour as Himself ! No-one can doubt His word when He says : "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work." None of us can open his mouth when this man says : "Which of you convinceth me of sin ?"

Once confronted by Him, we come to see that He really is human, and that we are not : we are not obedient to God and therefore at peace with Him, nor are we a help to our neighbour and therefore at peace with him. This man, being human, brings God's judgment upon our inhumanity ; this man,



being righteous, bring God's sentence upon our unrighteousness. The Son of Man is at the same time the Son of God, the only one in whom God is well pleased, whereas we, children of Adam, are prodigal sons, lost sheep which have gone astray. This was what Peter felt when he said: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord."

In thinking of Jesus as the crucified and risen Christ, we cannot pass by His challenging character as the Son of Man, whom St. Paul calls the second man, implying that since Adam He is the first true human being. For this — and nothing but this — was the reason why He had to die on the Cross; man cannot be tolerated in a world which has become deeply inhuman, whose institutions, programs and plans are made for sinners, for inhuman human beings and not for human children of God.

Jesus is an extremely disturbing element in this world, which simply cannot comply with His words: "Thou shalt love thine enemy." What is to become of this world if Jesus is right? The world says "property", and Jesus contradicts it: "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." The world says "justice", and Jesus answers: "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Therefore Caiaphas, speaking for this inhuman world — and whether it is pious or impious matters not, for it remains inhuman nevertheless — Caiaphas is right with his advice: "It is expedient to us, that one man — the one man — should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not."

### *Christ and the world*

I think it is of the greatest importance for us Christians to know that as long as there is sin in this world, and that means as long as it endures, Jesus Christ, the Son of Man and the Son of God, cannot be tolerated, cannot be acknowledged as the Lord, but has to be rejected. Christians who really believe in Him and follow Him as their Lord and Master, will always remain strangers and suspects, sheep among wolves, and the normal state of His Church is one of persecution, enmity of the world, and not friendship and peace.

This refers also and even primarily to the so-called Christian world, which always expects us to serve other masters besides Christ, and which always wishes us not to take Him too seriously. The Christian world wants Christ as a good servant for its own aims and ends, and when we comply, and only then, we have ease and peace. But if we insist upon Christ as our real and final authority, then it becomes clear that there is no room for Him, not even in a Christian world, except hanging on the Cross. The crucifixion of Jesus Christ is the last desperate act of self-defence of an inhuman world which will not give up its basic and corporate inhumanity.

And yet we, this world of ours, cannot get rid of him, because the crucified, dying man cannot be provoked into becoming inhuman also. Praying, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do", He clings to the sinful human generation, at the same time clinging to His heavenly Father, sustaining, bearing and overcoming in Himself the unimaginable tension, contrast and enmity between the Holy One and the sinner. It is here that something of the "power of God" working in the "preaching of the Cross" becomes evident. Here the world is overcome: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." His death means final victory, and we understand what Peter had in mind when he said: "It was not possible that he should be holden of death." Now is fulfilled the prophecy in the book of Isaiah: "Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." Christ the crucified was raised from the dead; He is the living Lord!

### *The meaning of forgiveness*

In the courtyard of our prison in the Dachau concentration camp, there stood a gallows. I had to look at it every day and to listen to its preaching, and I had to pray a good deal on its behalf. My fear was not that one day they would hang me there (you become accustomed to such a prospect, as you

become accustomed to the fact that you may have to face death at any time); my fear was what I would do when it happened. Would I then cry out with my last strength and breath: "You make me die as a criminal, but you yourselves are the real criminals; and there is a God in Heaven, and He will show you." If Christ had died this way, there would be no preaching of the Cross, no forgiveness, no salvation, no hope, for there would have been no reconciliation from God's side, no resurrection, for the Son of Man would not have been the Son of God in whom God was well pleased. He would not have been the "second man", bearing the undefiled image of God! He would have been only one more specimen of our race, of self-loving, sin-defiled, inhuman mankind. If I had died this way, I would have died in unbelief, not trusting that the prayer of Jesus was prayed for me and was accepted by God for me, for none of us can live by God's forgiveness and thus be reconciled to Him without becoming reconciled also to our enemies and without offering forgiveness to our fellow men.

Here a decision has to be made: the crucified and risen Christ wants to be the living Lord of our life, and that means that we ourselves have to be crucified with Him and be raised from the dead with Him, by faith. To be forgiven, to accept forgiveness, means to admit that we have been wrong, that our past must be blotted out, that our "old man" must die. It means to admit that through forgiveness we are given a new life which is not our own, but which belongs to Him by whose mercy we are spared, a new life by which we must bear witness to His forgiving love. To be forgiven, to accept forgiveness, means to become human children of God and human brothers to our fellow men, by faith: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." Here Christ really is the answer by which man in faith responds to God's action, to what God is doing to us in Christ and for Christ's sake.

I would like to explain what this means in practice by telling the second half of the story of the Good Samaritan. In the New Testament Jesus has told us only the first part,



but we can reconstruct the second from what He says in other contexts. After the Good Samaritan had brought him to the inn and left him to the care of the innkeeper, we lose sight of the man who had fallen among thieves. But he recovers and, having been robbed of his belongings and his money, he has to return to Jerusalem. On his way back he passes by the spot where he had been set upon and robbed. Suddenly he is taken by surprise and fright, for in that very place he sees a man lying wounded and half dead. His first reaction is to flee and to make his escape. Then he must think: what would have become of me if the stranger had done the same thing when I was lying there the other day? So he turns to help the wounded man because he cannot do otherwise. The man's face is blood-stained, his eyes are shut. For a moment awe overcomes him: is not this man one of the robbers who attacked me? But then the man opens his eyes and he recognizes him. It is — the Good Samaritan himself!

It is always the Good Samaritan, for this is what happens to us when we believe in Him, in the crucified and risen Christ, "who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification". We meet Him — and always Him — whenever we are faced with a human being in his misery and need. He is not just somebody; he is always the brother for whom Christ died, as he died for me. That includes any adversary and even any enemy: for Christ died for me, the sinner, the enemy of God. No-one can love his enemy, and it seems utterly useless to command us to do so, as Jesus actually does. But if we believe in the crucified and risen Christ, that is, in the forgiveness of God for His sake, then we cannot but love our enemy, because Jesus identifies Himself with him as he identifies Himself with us. I think that my greatest and most significant experience in many years has been to see that God is not the enemy of my enemies, that He is not even the enemy of His enemies. There was a time when I thought: "I have no responsibility for the supporters of the anti-Christian regime of nazism." I hated them and wished them everything bad, until I had to admit that there really is as much hope for them as for me, that God's forgiveness is offered to them as it is to me, that I am their debtor and not entitled to limit my Christian

responsibility according to my own judgment. I think that this is most important for our Christian task in this world. We Christians, living by faith in the crucified and risen Christ, must never overlook the fact that God's forgiveness and salvation is offered and has to be preached through us, to all men without discrimination. For God hates sin, but he loves the sinner whoever he may be, and we are always tempted to confound the two and to restrict the offer of God's forgiveness and our own to those who in some way agree with us. But "do not even the publicans so?"

### *The word of reconciliation*

As a result we Christians cannot simply take our stand with one side in secular power conflicts. We cannot, for example, fight for a "Christian world" against an "anti-Christian world", as we are sometimes expected to do. Certainly we cannot avoid making our choice, but in so doing we always remain under the restriction that we live by forgiveness, and that therefore our lives belong to our crucified and risen Lord, who died for us because He died for all. We cannot hate anyone whom Christ loves; and if someone wants us to hate, we have to resist, for God has "committed unto us the word of reconciliation". In all worldly disputes and strife in which people fight each other, we have to be aware that the Cross of Christ is standing in the midst, and that the living Lord is calling the people on both sides. We are not allowed to take this Cross and use it as a weapon against our enemies.

It ought to be clear that this in no way means that to be a follower of the crucified and risen Christ makes for indifference or inactivity. Ours is not a passive attitude towards what is going on in this world; we are passionately interested in national and international politics, in economic and social problems. And it is our Lord Himself who kindles our hearts through His spirit with a burning fire. But we are not interested in finding and carrying through the right system in order to reshape this world into a new paradise; we do not believe in any ideology, hoping that it will accomplish this aim, even if people have to suffer and be sacrificed for it. It is man him-

self, it is the human being, in which we as Christians are interested.

In the crucified Christ God made Himself the servant of man and sacrificed Himself for the sinner. Christ did not die for anything in this world, for nothing would have been worth this sacrifice. He did not die for His country, nor for a new world order, nor for progress — He died for man. And we are all called upon to serve man and to prevent his misuse as an instrument and means for anything else or for anyone else.

Thus the preaching of the crucified and risen Christ is, for those who listen and believe in Him, the strongest possible motive for responding to God's action by serving their fellow man to the best of their knowledge and ability. And the answer is Christ Himself, for the Lord who was crucified and raised again from the dead says: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."



# Witnessing in the University Communities

PHILIPPE MAURY <sup>1</sup>

## *God is witness*

Witness is an ambiguous but a rich word. It refers both to what we say and to what we are. We are witnesses, we are called to bear witness, and witness also qualifies the very content of our witnessing action : "Our witness is Jesus Christ." These various meanings might lead to some confusion ; that is why it is important to be clear about our starting point. The Bible leaves us no choice. The starting point is not in us but in God : God is witness. He is the first witness of all, and outside of Him no witness is possible. To witness is not to be preoccupied with our own difficulties, ideas or ethics, but to be preoccupied with God alone. The whole Bible makes it clear that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is also the great witness of God. He was proclaimed as such by the prophets : "I made him a witness to the peoples" (Isaiah 55: 4). And Jesus Himself described His mission as one of witness : "We speak of what we know and bear witness to what we have seen ; but you do not receive our testimony" (John 3 : 11). Finally, the Holy Spirit is the witness *par excellence*. He is God in us, witnessing to Jesus Christ. "God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba ! Father' " (Gal. 4 : 6), and "It is the spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. 8 : 16).

God is the witness who speaks of Himself, who warrants, authenticates Himself, declares Himself to be true. He is the ever-active witness, affirming before all men that He is God and that Christ is His Son. A recognition of this is indispensable to an understanding of the witnessing responsibility with

<sup>1</sup> Summary of an address delivered at the opening meeting of the W.S.C.F. General Committee.

which we have been entrusted. The theme of our General Committee meeting, "Witnessing in the University Communities", does not mean primarily that as S.C.M. members we have to be witnesses ; but rather that through us God is witnessing in the world, in the universities. We do not have to define a task or undertake a job. We affirm that God through His Spirit is now witnessing in His world. The job is being done, and we have only to recognize it. The initiative is not ours — it is God's, and ultimately the action is not ours but God's. But we must add immediately that, even though God is witnessing, even though we are unprofitable servants, we are called to be servants. Even though God does not need our witness, He wants it. The Bible tells us that we are made God's witnesses by His Holy Spirit.

### *Called to witness*

God does not remain without witnesses. He is constantly sending them into the world: "Upon your walls, O Jerusalem, I have set watchmen; all the day and all the night they shall never be silent. You who put the Lord in remembrance, take no rest" (Isaiah 62 : 6). We are the watchmen whom God has put on the walls of the world, to mention the name of the Lord, to call others, never to be silent. It is a heavy task never to be silent, but it is our task : "Be ready *always* to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you" (I Peter 3 : 15). We know only too well how difficult it is to obey this order ; how fearful we are of being unworthy of our message, of not finding the right words, of not speaking relevantly. We know often we are ashamed to witness to the Lord, to speak of our faith.

It is part of our duty to prepare ourselves for this witness, and that is why the Federation is concerned about theological education, how we can best prepare to witness by learning Jesus Christ's message. Theology is often criticized : "What's the use of it ?" But if we take seriously our witnessing responsibility, we know from our own experience the importance of theology, what a wonderful help it is, what a gap its absence creates, how helpless we are without it. Of course, this is not

theology in the technical sense of the word, but in its simple, etymological meaning — the knowledge of God. Many Student Christian Movements have requested help in this realm of theological teaching. While this may be a result of some temptation to escape from the confusion of the world into the safety of doctrinal orthodoxy, it certainly expresses also the need for a more comprehensive message, for a guide in our witness, that we may be able "at any moment" to give a reason of the hope that is in us.

### *The power of the Holy Spirit*

But theology is only a human instrument, and certainly not a trick to get rid of the risk in being a witness. For the Christian there is no assurance but in God, and our witness would be hopeless without the promise of God's power, of the inner witness of the Holy Spirit. The New Testament tells us of the miracles which the apostles performed by this power, as when Peter cured the lame man at the Gate Beautiful. We all know Jesus Christ's words: "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you" (Matt. 10: 18-20). The first act of faith of Christian witnesses is not to worry because of their weakness, their small numbers in a vast field, their past failures, their own unbelief, their revolt against God. Our witnessing does not depend on confidence in our own spiritual resources or our material strength, but on the blind expectation that what we need will be given us "in that same hour" when we have to speak. We are not promised a reserve which we can hold and upon which we can draw; we are promised immediate help at the moment of witness when it is needed. Not only will the words be given to us, but they will carry with them the power of the living Word of God. Like Jesus we shall speak "as having authority". We shall be witnesses in and with Jesus Christ. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servants whom I have chosen" (Isaiah



43:10). In witnessing we are never alone, but always with the Lord of the world who speaks through us, and we know that all powers have once for all been subject to Him. There is no longer any reason to fear, for it is not the quality of our words which matters but His presence.

This is one of the essential characteristics of witness which we are most apt to forget — that we are not the important element. The fruits of our witness do not depend on us; everything depends on Him. We serve, but the profit is from the Lord and for Him. In our S.C.M. work, whether personal or corporate, we are always worried about the lack of results. This is a terribly selfish, self-centred attitude. Jesus Christ is here, speaking through us, and He will make our human words His sovereign Word whenever He decides to do so. We simply have to be faithful, committing both our witness and those to whom it is addressed to Jesus Christ Himself. They are already in His hands, and He cares for them much better than we could. His love is much greater than our love, His forgiveness much vaster. We are not in charge of converting people; Jesus Christ alone can do it. We are simply witnesses, ambassadors for Christ, His representatives and spokesmen in the foreign world of the devil, speaking on His behalf, while He conquers, He reprieves, He renews. We only proclaim the good news, but in so doing we carry with us, as do all ambassadors, the authority and power of our King.

### *The apostolic succession*

What is the content of our witness? Here again we are too often inclined to think of ourselves, our experiences, our wisdom. While this is indeed helpful, our witness is primarily to Jesus Christ. The first witnesses in the New Testament are the apostles, "those who have seen and heard". It is significant that Thomas had to see and touch the Lord, that Paul insisted so much on the fact that he had seen Christ Himself, had received from Him personally, and not from men, His revelation. The apostles are the eye-witnesses. "Ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning" (John 15:27), says Jesus to His disciples. "Thou shalt be this witness unto all

men of what thou hast seen and heard" (Acts 22 : 15), says Ananias to Paul. We have not seen, but we have heard from the apostles. This is to me the meaning of the apostolic succession : we are founded on the witness of the apostles, those who have "testified of these things" (John 21 : 24), and when we believe, when we witness ourselves, it is on the guarantee of their witness of what they heard and saw. In this sense, we cannot witness alone, not only because we are always witnessing with Christ, but also because there is no witness but of the Church, within its fellowship, in the continuity of its tradition, on the basis of its apostolic faith.

What the apostles saw is the content of our witness : the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Thomas saw the Crucified, risen, and *then* became an apostle, a witness. When we witness we say that the Lord died for us, rose for us, and that we have life in Him : "This is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (I John 5 : 11). We witness to objective facts in past history, twenty centuries ago, and to objective facts in the future, objective though yet unseen : His coming Kingdom, His glory and our eternal life, now hidden with Him in God, but soon to be revealed in fulness, a life which we already live in faith and hope today.

### *Witnessing to the Kingdom*

We must witness not only in words but in life, by living on earth as people whose true existence is in the hidden coming Kingdom. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 5 : 16). This is not a call to morality, that we may be admired, and that through us God may be glorified. It is a call to witness. By living today *en Christo* we live in the Kingdom and are a constant manifestation of it. As Student Christian Movements we give a great deal of attention to our political and social responsibility. Politics is not only important in itself, as an effective form of Christian love ; experience has proved that it is, and must be, witness, prophetic proclamation of the Kingdom. When the Church fights for its unity, its fellowship, its sanctification, it also proclaims the Messianic

banquet in the Kingdom: it witnesses. All aspects of our collective and personal life can thus be related to Jesus Christ, and our whole life may become witness. A redeemed life may witness to the Redeemer.

We must always remember that Jesus Christ is both the subject and the object of our witness, but we must also speak as people personally committed and involved, as persons and to persons. Very often we would gladly speak about Jesus Christ. The difficulty comes when we discover that witnessing also means saying, like the Samaritan woman, "Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did" (John 4:29). When witnessing to Christ we cannot avoid speaking of what He did for us personally, and looking at our own hearts, when we witness to other men's hearts, proclaiming judgment and forgiveness, both of their sin and for our own. Witness inevitably establishes a personal relationship between men which is much deeper than any friendship, any love, because it is a relationship in Jesus Christ Himself. When witnessing we become pastors to one another, or rather, we should become pastors to one another. This is perhaps the most disturbing aspect of our task, but in it also the Spirit of God is promised.

### *Messengers of joy*

We often ask ourselves: why witness? and I may be criticized for not having dealt with this question first. But it seems to me that it is precisely because witness is not essentially a logical decision of people who can foresee its result. It is first obedience to an order or mission of God: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations" (Matt. 28:19). It is even more in the very nature of the message to be proclaimed: "We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard" (Acts 4:20). The news is so wonderful, glorious, joyful, that we cannot keep it for ourselves alone. A recent French film entitled "We Are All Murderers" tells about people condemned to death. They wait in their cells, and the film shows this endless waiting, in fear, in anguish each night before dawn, fearing even one another, and the meaninglessness of their lives, until the supreme horror of the last morning. It seems to me that we are somewhat like



them. Our lives are like a cell in which we await hopelessly the end of all things, trying to forget ; but nothing can have any real meaning because of the last day, and men fear and hate one another. Each thinks of himself alone. But as Christians we know that the Lord has forgiven, that we have all been reprieved, that we are saved, that our lives, the lives of all us prisoners awaiting execution are no longer under that shadow. We are still in the cell, but only for a short time, and life is joyful again. It has a meaning, we can love our neighbour, we can be interested in all the little things of daily life, we can look to the future with hope. How can we fail to share this marvellous news of our reprieve with the other prisoners ? If we do not tell them, we simply show that we do not believe it to be true. That is the reason for Christian witness : we have heard that everything has been made new and beautiful, that redemption is for everyone and freely given, and we tell it abroad, because our message is joy for all those who understand and accept it.

### *Within the secular world*

We do not witness in the abstract but among men, and as Student Christian Movements we bear a particular responsibility in a particular community — the university. During recent years the Federation has laid particular emphasis on this fact that as men, as students, we are dependent upon, we are shaped by, the human communities to which we belong, and on the fact that Jesus Christ, Lord of all these communities, of all realms of life, is always their saving Lord. This means that our message must be proclaimed to men not only as individuals to be driven out of their communities, but as participants in them, and even proclaimed to those communities themselves. It has often been pointed out that our greatest temptation today may be to assume that as the Church we are outside of the world, if not physically at least spiritually, and to forget our profound solidarity with it, that we are bound up with it . We share in the sin, in the revolt, in the misery of the world. We are not yet in God's glory, but still on earth. Not only are we in the world, but Jesus Christ has sent us into it. We cannot go to it with any

sense of superiority or self-righteousness ; we are in the world in the full sense of the word, in the same boat, for good and for evil. The promise of Christ was made to the world : "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son" (John 3 : 16). Christ died for all, and we are privileged only in that we know it while others are still in ignorance. When witnessing to Christ's salvation we cannot speak *ex cathedra* from some ivory tower. We always speak to ourselves at the same time as we speak to other men. The only difference between us and them is that we have already heard the message, and thus have the added responsibility to speak as well as to listen, to be ambassadors in the world as well as citizens of the world. We are the Church, but we are also citizens of our nation, our minds shaped by a particular culture, our emotions marked by family heritage and custom. We are bound to the world by a whole complex of affections, habits and roots. We are the Church within the world, sharing in the world, the Church of Christ, but also the Church of men and women.

This should remind us not to witness in an abstract, un-oriented fashion. All men are of flesh, and our witness must be directed to them as they are in this secular world. We must take seriously this secular character of the student world. One of our greatest dangers at the present moment is that of isolating ourselves from the secular, hostile, dangerous world in what I have called an ivory tower. And what we call religion may become just such an ivory tower. Religion is an easy but a very dangerous word. On the one hand, when we use it we tend to put our faith on the same level as other religions, considering it as another form of some particular human faculty — our religious nature ; or else we slip into some form of syncretism or indifferentism. In a way religion is always idolatry in that through it man tries to sublimate himself into some respectable spirituality, forgetting his own humanity, worshipping in himself what he considers most admirable, purest, least material and relative. In this sense Christianity is no religion ; it is the message of God making Himself man, material, relative and not ideal. It is not a beautiful construction of men's minds ; it comes entirely from God to men and to men of flesh and blood, calling for their acceptance and commitment.

On the other hand, religion tends to segregate us from other people. We are the religious people, and we find in this a certain respectability. Among sinners we are the holy, the good, the pure: in other words, the Pharisees, for whom religious piety and obedience are a safe protection against the disturbing questions of Jesus Christ. Then religion becomes a terrible iron curtain separating us from God and from other men. As Student Christian Movements let us beware of becoming the Pharisees of our universities. The word ghetto is used more and more often to describe the careful isolation, the comfortable closed fellowship of the Church in the world, of the S.C.M. in the student world.

### *An open Church*

We should rather learn anew that the Church, while it is the Body of Christ, is, and must be, truly secular. This does not mean, of course, that we should behave according to the rules of the world, but that we should recognize our solidarity with it, be in the very midst of it, be the place where all men are welcome. We must remember how Jesus spent his time with publicans, prostitutes, politicians, all sorts of secular people, and what severe words he had for the Scribes, the Pharisees, the theologians and church leaders, all the religious *élite* of His day. We must be His imitators — the Church where all secular people are at home, where they hear the message of Jesus Christ to them in their secularism. We must be the S.C.M. in which students find themselves at ease because they are members of the university, of its political groups, of its social clubs, of its athletic associations, and not because they are trying to escape from them into religion. We can be this, only if our purpose is the same as that of Christ, if we are secular because the Gospel is for secular people, if we are open to all because we wish to witness to all. We also tend easily to individualism, to forget that the Bible always speaks in terms of communities, groups and societies: the people of Israel, the nations, the families of the earth, the Church. We have seen that our witness is always the Church's witness. It is also always addressed to human groups as well as to individuals



in those groups. We must take very seriously our belonging to human institutions or groups, because they have a significance before God. For instance, in thinking of our missionary responsibility in 1953 we are bound to take into account all those political realities — nations, big powers, ideologies, parties — which seem to be the forces most directly shaping our lives. On the other hand, as students we are directly involved and dependent upon the university as an institution of culture and learning and as a specific human community, and our witness must also be directed to it. As members of those communities we must witness to them, not only in order to do something for their members but for them as such — to change them, to lead them towards something more in accordance with the Kingdom in which we are already citizens : a better society, more just and free, a truer peace, a greater understanding among nations, races, classes, a university worthier of its name, where culture is spread, science advanced, truth respected, a university open to all where all are one together, a true *universitas*.

### *A witnessing community*

All this explains why the S.C.M. has been described as a witnessing community. We must be one of those communities in the university which shape our minds and have our loyalties. But this we can do only if we remember two things. We must not aim to be a community for its own sake. It is well that in the expression, witnessing community, the word witnessing comes first. As an S.C.M. we are a fellowship because, and in so far as, we are witnessing. An S.C.M. which took as its goal building up its community as an end in itself, would cease to be Christian and would never build any sense of Christian community, for it would lack its very foundation, Jesus Christ, who by nature is to be witnessed to. On the other hand, as an S.C.M. we are a witnessing community, not only when we are gathered together but also, and perhaps primarily, when we are scattered in all the secular communities in which we are involved. Our weekly meetings, our common prayers, our Bible studies, our conferences and retreats are only points of

departure, moments of preparation for sharing, and our real task, our true existence as an S.C.M. is when, as individual members, we go into the university, into the world, witnessing as members of the S.C.M. Witness is not a business for specialized meetings, but our common and continuing responsibility. It is through this scattered witness that the Lord to whom we witness will gather us into His community.

I have dealt with almost all aspects of the program in the life of the Federation except one, namely, the Church and the ecumenical movement. This is no accident. Everything we have seen about the significance of witness and our responsibility with regard to it amounts to a description of the Church in its living reality. For the Church itself is witness to Jesus Christ, and the ecumenical movement is a striving towards unity through and for common witness. One thing should be added, however. As S.C.M. members we should have a great humility before the Church, above all before the Lord to whom we witness, remembering that He is the important element, that we have to be His imitators, and that we must be ready to bear with Him in the fellowship of the Church the burden of witness, which is suffering. It may be an appropriate conclusion to this study of witness in 1953 to remember that in Greek the word martyr is the same as the word witness. This does not mean that we should look for persecution, for suffering is not something which God wishes for us. We know how Jesus feared it in Gethsemane. But we must be ready to accept it if God sends it to us, and pray that He will give us strength through suffering to bear witness.

# Ambassadors for Christ

TSUNEGORO NARA <sup>1</sup>

## *Obstacles to evangelism*

Among the various obstacles to our evangelistic task in Japan, the most persistent is the unconscious antipathy towards Christianity which has existed in the minds of my people ever since it first came to Japan and was treated by the Japanese authorities and introduced to the people in general as a scandalous religion with an evil doctrine. This unconscious antagonism prevails even among young intellectuals and contributes to their reluctance to accept Christianity.

Secondly, Christianity is still regarded by my people as a foreign religion. As long as it does not become indigenous in Japanese life, as Buddhism has, it will be very hard for us to make our evangelism effective.

Thirdly, the ethics of the Japanese community are based upon the religious and moral ideas of Shintoism, Confucianism and Buddhism, which have been accepted and made part of Japanese life. Christianity came to our country mingled with a modern Western culture which is not at all homogeneous with things traditionally Japanese.

In Japanese society the collective consciousness or group-mind takes precedence over the individual; the people lack a consciousness of the individual personality, and their ethics are not based upon any such consciousness. The maintenance of order and the communal society to which they belong, rather than the inward voice of the conscience of man as a person, provides their ethical motivation. In other words, their ethics are a mode of action imposed upon them from without. Consequently our people are keenly aware of "shame", while they are scarcely conscious of "sin". This difficulty for evangelism in Japan — that of making people understand what sin is —

<sup>1</sup> Extract from an address delivered to the W.S.C.F. General Committee.



is one of the reasons why the Christian Church there is developing only in the modernized, urban society and not in the traditional society of the rural areas. The seeds of the Gospel are sowed in very "rocky soil" in Japan.

Still rockier are the minds and lives of intellectuals in Japan today. Modern rationalism, individualism, science and technology, introduced into our country from the Western world, have to some extent improved social conditions. However, while in the West, at least in the beginning, modern culture and civilization had deep roots in Protestant Christianity, only the superficial part of this culture — its secularized part — was imported into Japan. One might say that we have had the Renaissance in our modern history, but not the Reformation, in the true sense of that word.

For instance, we have a kind of individualism in our society. But as one of our University Commission members has said, it is an atomistic individualism which neglects personal relationships between people. This leads only to selfish and extremely unethical and negative behaviour. It may become aggressive self-seeking or, in its best expression, a seeking merely for inner freedom for the egotistical individual, with no motivation of a feeling for communion with other personalities. As a result there is no ground for the development of real democracy in Japan. There is no "man" in the true sense of the word, and no "personal community".

In this stream of cultural development, the task of the Christian is to help our people discover "what is man?" It is to help them realize that to become a Christian is not to assume a specific "colour" called "Christian", which they dislike intensely, but to be reborn as a whole man, to become a true man through the redemptive love of Christ. To make communities true communities, to make families true families, and to make universities true universities — this is the aim of evangelism in Japan today.

### *University students*

Now what about the university students? Let me describe briefly the kind of society in which they have grown up. Students of today, nineteen to twenty-three years of age, spent

their childhood in the later period of the Sino-Japanese incident and the early part of the second world war, when the Japanese military system was greatly strengthened and permeated every realm of life, including education. The ideas of Japanese invincibility and the justification for her war aims were instilled into their minds. During their teens, their studies were frequently interrupted by military drill and so-called "industrial mobilization". These years held little happiness, but were filled with fear for their lives, threatened by frequent air raids and consumed by the fires of war.

Then they found themselves face to face with the nation's defeat, at an age when they could hardly understand its real meaning. Their families lost all their property in the terrible economic collapse and the social convulsions which followed the surrender. They saw their people openly breaking laws and regulations to secure their daily bread. At an age when they were becoming conscious of social problems, they were experiencing terrific changes in every aspect of their lives — the reformation of the school system, educational methods and the curriculum ; the change in traditional moral ideas ; the collapse of the authority and power of the state in which they had had absolute faith, and finally, the appearance of the new authorities called the "Occupation Forces". Due to the financial difficulties of this post-war period, the economic basis of student life became extremely uncertain. At present seventy-four per cent of all students need to work to pay their school expenses, but last year of these only thirty-two per cent could find suitable jobs.

### *Psychological effects*

What have been the psychological effects upon the minds of the students of these social circumstances ? Their disillusionment about the absolute authority of the state and Japan's invincibility was most tragic. A deep sense of distrust and scepticism about the state, government, law and all established institutions was engraved into their hearts, and created a peculiar mentality which does not believe in any kind of idealism or good will. There is a strong nihilistic tendency prevailing among them.

They have seen man's egoistic nature and his betrayal in the extreme social confusion of the post-war period, and the economic destitution served as an object lesson of the powerlessness of a human society which has lost all consciousness of its solidarity. As a result, a keen sense of dissatisfaction with society as a whole, and, on the other hand, a strong instinct for self-preservation were deeply stamped on their minds.

The relief from the continual pressure of war-time existence and the constant threat to their lives led to a strong passion for life itself, or to a deep antipathy towards everything associated with the shadow of death. Their desire for self-realization and self-assertion is intense, and seems to contradict their nihilism.

The weakness and unbecoming behaviour of their own race was exposed before their eyes, and they came to have a kind of racial inferiority complex, which developed into a powerful anti-foreign feeling, especially towards a country whose physical superiority they could not help recognizing. It seems that our people's general feeling towards America is very favourable. Every visitor to Japan speaks appreciatively of "Japanese courtesy and cordiality". But it is dangerous to overlook the fact that it contains an element of flattery and empty compliments for a superior, which is peculiar to Japanese psychology.

I think with deep sympathy of the difficulties of American missionaries in Japan. They can hardly reach the hearts of the best kind of students. We must cooperate more fully and profoundly to prove ourselves good ambassadors to the wicked hearts of these lost-generation students of Japan.

# A Redeemed Life

## The Christian Gospel of redemption as the foundation of a true secular humanism

M. M. THOMAS<sup>1</sup>

### *Entanglement and disentanglement*

It is often said that the Church is too entangled with the world, that it has identified itself with East or West in the political struggle, that it has settled down in contemporary culture and made itself at home with national, racial and class ideologies, and that in repentance it should disentangle itself. This emphasis, coming in the modern period from European theology, has helped the Church to regain its independence from the old disintegrating order, and has set it on the road to seek for the City whose builder and maker is God. But too often the advocates of disentanglement of the Church from the world do not go on to make clear that any withdrawal from the world must be made only in order that the Church may re-enter it with Christ. Too often in the recent past Christianity has become an appendage of a pagan movement of secular humanism, in which man's capacity for self-redemption has been affirmed. And it was right that a prophetic protest against this should arise in the Church itself. But the Christian in the world cannot live on protests ; his life is a continual involvement in the secular world of nature and man. Unless the principles of a positive involvement are worked out, protest-theology can create a vacuum which may turn out to be as perilous as that unscrupulous involvement. The Christian doubtless needs to be constantly reminded that he is a pilgrim who should not settle down and make the world his home. But even a pilgrim needs to set up temporary tents along his way. The Christian opposition to pagan humanism should be in the name of a

<sup>1</sup> A summary of an address delivered to the W.S.C.F. General Committee.



true humanism, I might even say a Christian humanism, in spite of the suspicion that phrase may arouse in the minds of some Christians.

### *The Gospel and secular faiths*

The significance of the second Report of the Commission on Christian Hope of the World Council of Churches is that it deals with precisely this question of the relation of the Gospel to the secular utopias of today. No ecumenical document has been more relevant to the situation we face in the world, and I hope it will be studied throughout the Federation. The Report takes up three secular ideologies which appeal to modern man, and places them in the light of the Christian Gospel: stalinism, scientific humanism and democratic utopianism. Let us look at the Commission's interpretation of the rise of these ideologies and of the reason for their perversion.

First, the Report says that all these ideologies "in some way bear witness to the great disturbance which God's revelation in Christ has made in the world", for "it is in part at least the ferment set up by its preaching and life which has brought these ferments in the world". In other words, the human aspirations which are basic to these various ideologies have their origin in the Christian revelation. The passion for social justice which underlies the origins of stalinism, the search for rational truth which is basic to scientific humanism, and the principles of human individuality and social equality which lie behind democratic utopianism — all these have their roots in the Christian understanding of man and the world.

Secondly, the Report answers the question: why have they betrayed their original humanitarian purposes? We know that stalinism has destroyed the social revolution in the process of making it and has become a new form of social oppression. Scientific humanism has produced techniques of engineering natural and social forces which serve to destroy human values. Democratic utopianism, with its faith in the "freedom of the individual", has destroyed mutual responsibility and the values of individuality and equality. Why this betrayal? Why has humanism in many parts of the world turned into its opposite? The Report answers: because humanism came to be separated

from its original Christian roots. "... in our day, in one way or another, these various aspirations have escaped the setting and discipline of the gospel of Jesus Christ, wherein alone they can be espoused without the most terrible perversion." Outside the Christian setting, men use these movements to "assume a status and a posture under the sun which does not belong to them" and thus "destroy their very manhood and that of their fellows".

In this context we must ask : where do we see the results of man's rebellion against God in stalinism, scientific humanism and democratic utopianism ? What is it that corrupts, perverts and finally destroys the human aspirations which find expression in the secular humanist movements of our time. To this we may answer : utopianism. It has two results :

1. *Self-righteousness.* St. Paul in Romans 7 speaks of the impossibility of man doing the good he would : he intends to love his neighbour, but he does just the opposite. Love as an ideal or law is impossible of fulfilment, because it cannot be commanded to appear. What we ought to do, we cannot. Utopianism overlooks the contradiction at the core of moral idealisms. Believing in the capacity of ideals to achieve what they intend, modern humanism embarks on its program of moral and social uplift as a "holy crusade", and in so doing falls into a ruthless self-righteousness. History is full of instances of men entering upon holy moral and political crusades and turning into Grand Inquisitors. Nicolas Berdyaev has said that it was in seeking to create an inner communion of men (communism) that stalinism entered upon the path of tyranny. The belief that it is possible through political action to achieve a final harmony in society invests communism with a self-righteousness that turns the party into one of tyrants. If American youth were a little more suspicious of their own idealism, we in Asia would feel much safer, for the self-righteousness associated with the American way of life and expressed today in an anti-communist crusade may unconsciously end in an American imperialism extending throughout the world.

2. *Belief in history.* Utopianism conceives the end of history as within history itself ; it looks to a future society within the

historical process as the final goal towards which all history is moving. It therefore says at every turn, "History will judge", "What succeeds is right". If man knows no judgment other than that of the future, he will be concerned to create a future generation that will judge him to be right. The anxiety for success becomes a moral necessity for the man who wants to justify himself before the bar of history, and his search for power to control the future in order to vindicate his present decisions, makes him inhuman. This is the secret of much of the ruthlessness behind the revolutions of our time, whether democratic or stalinist.

Thirdly, the Commission Report frankly admits the share of the Church in the apostasy of humanism from its true Christian setting and the resulting disaster. The Report says of the Church: "Its own understanding of its message has been too restricted, too cribbed and cabined to the confines of a passing piety, to enable it to keep these ferments within the compass of that by which alone they can be judged and hallowed... By its failure to measure its vision by the dimensions of the gospel, the height, the breadth and the depth of the love of God for man in the flesh of Jesus Christ, it has allowed the aspirations of humanity to serve the purpose of hell rather than the glory of God."

### *The whole Gospel*

The need is therefore for the Church to repent of its one-sided understanding of the Gospel of Christ and to recapture it in its wholeness, as affirming everything truly human in the redemption it offers to mankind. If utopianism, with its easy path to self-righteousness and its fear of the future, is the source of corruption in modern movements of humanism, there is need for the Church to understand afresh and to proclaim to the world the Gospel of the crucified and risen Lord as the only basis for a true humanism. Two elements of the Gospel need special emphasis in this connection:

1. *The New Age beyond the end of history.* What is our theological starting point? I remember a speech by the late A. M. Verkey of Alwaye College, Travancore. "Do you realize,"

he asked in the course of an address to a student audience, "the tremendous implications of our declaration of faith in the physical resurrection of Christ, the revolutionary significance of the fact that the tomb was empty?" It came as something surprisingly new to me. Like many others, I had come to Christ in the tradition of pure spirituality and individual piety. I do not regret that tradition. But here was a challenge to its one-sidedness. If Christ rose in the body, the redemption He wrought was not merely of my spirit or soul, but of the whole of me, body, mind and soul, and of the whole of my relationship to nature and to men.

In the Nicene Creed, we declare our faith: "And the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end." These are affirmations, not only about Christ, but also about the secular world and human history. They declare that the whole creation has been reconciled to God in Christ, that He rules it, and that He will come again in glory to consummate His Kingdom. This drama of Christ's resurrection, His present rule and His second coming takes place beyond the end of history — for history ends with death — and points to a New Age, which is the goal of "the whole created world", the cosmos. It gives a final point of reference and meaning for history.

The whole world does not see this truth about itself. But a part of it does: the Church is that part of the world which knows the nature and historical destiny of the whole world. The Church lives acknowledging Christ's redemption and His rule over the secular world and human history, and lives to proclaim it among men, both by word and deed. As the World Council Commission Report says, the New Age beyond the end of history is "the final redemption of both the Church and the 'whole created world' — at once judgment, transformation and fulfilment".

2. *The power of the Cross.* There is only one place at which the self-righteousness of the good man and the holy crusader can break: at the Cross of Jesus Christ, where every man sees himself as a murderer of the Son of God, and knows himself



forgiven by Him. This doctrine of justification by faith is the only ultimate basis for true community. Jesus told a story to illustrate this. Two men went up to the temple to pray. The Pharisee thanked God because he was not like the publican. He divided mankind into the moral and immoral, the holy and the unholy. Jesus said that this is not the way man achieves manhood. The Pharisee returned home more self-centred and more incapable of loving his neighbour than before. But the publican beat his breast and prayed, "O Lord, have mercy upon me a miserable sinner"; and Christ said he went home a righteous man, that is, having right relations with God and his neighbour. True human community is the community of forgiven sinners. Love has ceased to be a law or an ideal; in grateful response to the forgiveness of Christ through His death, it becomes a spontaneous fact. True community has become a possibility because a new motive — gratitude — has taken the place of the old self-defeating motive of duty. It is necessary to emphasize that justification by faith leads spontaneously to good works, that the experience of forgiveness is an experience of the power of the New Age here and now, of the "this-sidedness" of the resurrection.

It is, however, not enough to emphasize the purely personal aspect of the power of sanctification, and to leave society and politics outside it. There was a time when I thought that the New Age of Christ was so much beyond history that it could be experienced in politics only as forgiveness and not as power, that political philosophy could be only a philosophy of sinful necessities where the Cross was relevant only as forgiveness to the politician, and not as qualifying politics, political parties, techniques and institutions as such. That is to say, the power of the Cross was considered as "beyond politics". No doubt, when the depth of sin in the collective life of man is realized, it is natural to speak of "moral man and immoral society". But certain questions remained with me: Can Christ only judge politics? Can He not also in some measure redeem it here and now? Cannot forgiveness be realized as power in the structures of the collective and institutional life of man in society? Certainly there will be a gulf between a politics of justice and the life of charity until Christ comes, and there

may be times when politics becomes so terribly perverted that the tension between the two is extremely tragic. But I believe that it is possible for politics itself to be redeemed from its extreme perversions and be made more or less human, if it recognizes and receives into itself the power of the Gospel. This emphasis on the redemption of the secular collective life of man through the power of the Cross is lacking in the World Council Commission Report.

### *Redefinition of secular humanism*

The Commission, after presenting its theological affirmations and its diagnosis of the reason for the failure of pagan humanism, goes on to consider the positive Christian task in this situation. At this point, however, one gets the feeling that the ultimate Christian hope is presented as a substitute for or an alternative to the provisional human hopes and aspirations expressed in the secular humanist utopias of our time. It is certainly not that. Christianity is not an alternative for social revolution, or science, or democracy, and we certainly need movements and ideologies to affirm the values of social, political and economic justice, and of rational scientific pursuits, and to build up liberal secular democratic states based on the fundamental rights of the human person. There is an attempt to run away from such movements and ideologies in the Commission's Report. This is understandable in Europe which has come to the end of the Renaissance and the Reformation. But in other parts of the world, such as Asia, we are only at the beginning of the Renaissance. Here socialism, nationalism and democracy denote forces that speak to man of liberation. In such situations the Christian task is not to fight shy of humanist ideologies and movements, but to present the faith, love and hope of the Gospel of Christ as the power which can redeem them from their "most terrible perversion" and re-establish them in such a way that they do not betray, but realize, their true human ends. Our opposition to pagan nationalism is not primarily because it rebels against Christ, but because in so rebelling it betrays the values it seeks to achieve for man. We present Christ as the basis on which nationalism can be redefined

and a truly national movement can take shape. So also with democracy. The Bangkok conference of East Asian church leaders said that democracy was weak and tended to break down in Asia because it was separated from its Christian roots, and that the Christian task was to "redefine, revitalize and reinforce" the democratic forces and values in the light of the Christian faith, so that they may endure. Bangkok also felt that "a true social democratic" revolution might be the answer to stalinism. All this may sound irrelevant to Europe, but it is not necessarily so to Asia. And the only plea one can make in this connection to the World Council Commission is that it not be guided entirely by the Continental European situation in its formulation of the positive Christian tasks *vis-à-vis* stalinism, scientific humanism and democratic utopianism. In Asia at least, Christians certainly have a more positive task in relation to the forces and ideologies of socialism, science and democracy. And only if Christians are prepared to enter into that task of redefinition of the dynamic, modern, ideological and political movements of our time, can the relevance of the Gospel be made clear to modern pagans, who deify man and use his hopes to enhance their own self-righteousness and to show forth their mastery over their own destiny. Christians, called as Christians to fight for socialism, science and democracy, are the people in Asia who will best witness to the power of Christ to redeem the "multitude of hopes for man in his temporal history and temporal concerns". *Ecce homo* will be intelligible only in the context of such a Christian witness in the world.

# Evangelism —

## The Gospel to the Whole Man

PETER KREYSSIG<sup>1</sup>

What do we mean by evangelism ?

When we speak of evangelism we are not concerned with it solely as the proper method of bringing the Gospel to man. Although the question of method is extremely relevant here, it in no way includes the whole question of evangelism as it confronts us today. Nor can it be adequately defined in a description of its origin or purpose, or even of the content of its message. For evangelism primarily involves persons, at what might be called both the “active” and the “receiving” end of it. Let us define it this way: Evangelism is an *event* which in a singular way binds together the evangelizing and the evangelized in an act of God’s love. St. Paul, who has a facility for making some of his most profound theological statements in a parenthesis, expresses it beautifully: “My little children, with whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you...” (Gal. 4 : 19). Here the human relationship in evangelism is strikingly described as an act of birth: in bringing new life into the world there are always two lives at stake! This brief sentence also contains everything that could be said about the nature and purpose of evangelism itself: “... until Christ be formed in you”. That is evangelism to man as a whole being: through the impact of the Gospel, Christ forms man into His likeness, in an act of “configuration” to Himself, who on behalf of man became man, was crucified and rose from the dead.

When man is transformed into this threefold likeness, he becomes a real, whole man again. This does not mean that he is at peace with himself and the world at large; perhaps

<sup>1</sup> Summary of an address delivered to the W.S.C.F. student conference at Tambaram.



he is even less so than before. But he is no longer torn apart in the strife within and around him, for as an individual he is also an integral part of the community which bears the same marks as his Lord and he. This is why the Church is called the Body of Christ. It is designed to manifest this new reality of life in space and time, to show what it means that in Christ's incarnation, death and resurrection, the reality of God has entered the realities of the world. To proclaim and to live out this new reality within the world — that is the evangelistic task of the Church, which is nothing but that part of humanity where the likeness of Christ is made manifest to the world and to individuals, that they may also see and believe. Evangelism is therefore not one task of the Church among others — it is in its very essence, and by the fruits of its evangelism we recognize whether it is alive or dead.

The content of evangelism, the Gospel, is what we say in describing this threefold likeness of Christ: the problem of method is *how* to say it. But neither of these aspects can be seen apart from the question of *who* is saying it and to *whom*, and it is this latter aspect with which we are largely concerned here: the evangelistic encounter of the Church with the world, of the Christian with modern secular man.

### *Evangelism in the modern world*

It is obvious from our definition of evangelism that the new reality of a redeemed life in the likeness of Christ must be made manifest in all realms of human life. Precisely because we believe in its universal relevance, we proclaim it as the only remedy for the disintegration of the world. And here we encounter our greatest difficulties.

In our effort to convince the world that Christ is the answer to all its problems, we make the disillusioning discovery that the world not only doubts that statement very much — we expect that kind of scepticism — but frequently feels that where we see a problem, there is really none at all. And even if the world acknowledges the problem, it is perfectly and blissfully certain that it has no need of a God to solve it. It is this optimism which more than anything else infuriates Christ-

ians, this cool detachment behind a seemingly new readiness to discuss the Christian point of view — which is sometimes more shattering than open persecution. What is the cause of it?

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, in some of the letters written from his cell, analyzes the spiritual situation of the West as follows: the process of secularization, that it, the movement towards human autonomy and a self-contained world, has in our day come to real maturity and relative completion. In all scientific problems, in questions of art and even of ethics, people maintain that they can do without God as a “working hypothesis”, and during the last hundred years this has been true also of religious problems. God is slowly being pushed out of one compartment of life after another. He is, so to speak, in retreat. This, for a Christian, almost blasphemous statement is made without irony. It describes a brutal fact which we should face. But are we facing it? Do we not in our evangelistic efforts often meet modern secular man as if his main problem were still Luther’s question of the Reformation: how can I as a sinner obtain God’s grace? But he no longer feels himself to be a sinner. He merely feels “insecure”, or he has “psychological problems”. The term “sin” is no longer meaningful to him. His main question — if it still concerns God at all — is this: how can I be sure there is a living God ruling the universe and my personal life within it?

The chief error in our evangelistic efforts based upon this analysis is that we do not take this question seriously. We set out to prove that man is wrong in asking it. We look for weak spots or cracks in his armour of worldly self-sufficiency, and try to pierce it there. There are, of course, problems with which even a scientifically self-contained world cannot cope: that of personal guilt or of a man’s own death, the question of human suffering, natural catastrophes and so forth, and through which one might conveniently introduce God to a helpless fellow man. Finding it difficult to confront man with God in the firm strongholds of his life, we sneak around his house and try to sell religion at the back door, where he is off guard.

If we are a bit more courageous, we attack these strongholds themselves, trying to explode the feeling of strength and security

which secular man still has in some compartments of his life, thus "preparing" him for the healing power of the Gospel. We tell him, for example, that his scientific optimism which produces means to make the world a happier place has in reality a quite disastrous effect because of his inherent sinfulness. In that sense the atomic bomb has very often been made a powerful instrument of evangelism, in the thinly-veiled hope that a panic of fear might eventually drive man into the open arms of the Church. In this kind of evangelistic strategy, we try to undermine in man's life one secular stronghold after another, and then to blow it up, hoping that a structure of faith may then be erected on the shattered ruins of his sinful self-confidence.

### *The reaction of secular man*

To our surprise secular man reacts resentfully and negatively to this treatment. In the first place, he feels that merely harping on his unsolved problems and refusing to take his own statements seriously is rather unfair. He dislikes to be told that his belief that he is happily married is — to the penetrating eye of the Christian — a mere delusion which cannot last because it is threatened by the corruption of human sinfulness. Secondly, he has the impression — quite rightly — that the problem of disintegration in his life is not really solved by either approach. The first ignores whole parts of his existence where he feels tolerably safe, and evangelism is concentrated on the sore points, a method of treatment which science itself, for example, psychosomatic medicine, thinks is quite outdated. In the second, disintegration is itself made a part of the "therapy": man must be entirely taken apart before he can be reassembled into a Christian personality.

Thirdly, he points out — again quite rightly — that Christians themselves, by implying that these problems of disintegration are to be solved only within the realm of the Church, find it difficult to prove this statement in their own lives. They are not all integrated persons whose marriages never fail, who have no ethical problems, and who know the Christian answer to everything. Now the Christians in their turn begin to realize

the truth of some of these criticisms, and frantically try to remove their causes. Certainly our lives must be conformed to our message, but by staring fixedly at this obstacle in the path of our evangelism we give it the predominance which it had under the law. Our ethics become casuistic, and we begin to erect signposts along our way : Christians simply must not do this or that. The original task of presenting the Gospel has changed subtly into the actual presentation of a law both to the world and to ourselves — a Christian law, perhaps, but nevertheless a law. Our analysis of the world, under an almost complete process of secularization, has tempted us to try to reverse the process, or rather to substitute for it a process of re-Christianization, to draw the world back into the realm of the Church from which it has escaped in the course of history, to win back step by step strongholds lost in the course of secularization.

*The relation between the Church and the world*

What is the reason for this strange transformation of our evangelistic intentions ? Somehow there remains alive in our minds the traditional thinking about the relationship of Church and world, which pictures them spatially as two static realms barely touching, or only peripherally intersecting, each dominated by its own laws and engaged in an attempt to fight and swallow up the other. Historically, this view found its most extreme expression in the Middle Ages when emperor and pope, as the respective heads of these realms, tried to fight out the issue of predominance in every conceivable sphere of the spiritual, political and economic life of their time. The struggle ended with the downfall of the spiritual empire of the Church and the emancipation of the secular world.

But the picture of this fight still influences our thinking about evangelism. We forget, for example, that in the Bible there are several meanings of the word "world". And the significance of this fact, generally speaking, is to prevent us from forming just a "static" picture of the world as something merely opposed to the Church : the profane as against the sacred, the natural against the supernatural, revelation against reason,



and so forth. We should not forget that these have also been reconciled in Christ's incarnation. As Bonhoeffer puts it very strongly, this means that just as Christ entered the world, so the Christian exists within the worldly, the supernatural only within nature, the sacred in the realm of the profane, revelation in the context of reason. It means for us as persons that our being in the likeness of Christ manifests in our daily lives this merging of God's reality with the reality of the world.

This is not to say that the Church and the world are identical. But their relationship is dynamic in the sense that they have to prevent one another from becoming spatial and static realms in themselves. Luther's protest against this spatial interpretation of the Church as the only realm of salvation consisted in an exodus from the monastery into a Christian life in the world in order that the Church might become itself again. So also in our day the Church's protest against the world becoming an autonomous and self-sufficient realm must call it — not to become the Church — but to be in reality the world God wanted it to be. Our protest must be for the sake of the world in the name of the better world of which we know. It is spatial and static thinking about the relation of Church and world which turns our evangelism into a preaching of the law. The inherent danger of this conception is that we either try hard to identify ourselves with the world and in our evangelization fail to understand that it still has to realize the fact of its salvation, or that we simply withdraw into the safe and warm shelter of the "perfect community" in the Church and wash our hands of this sad affair called the world. The monk of the Middle Ages and the *Kulturprotestant* of the last century mark the two possible extremes to which this conception leads. From this spatial thinking, the fatal postulate of the "perfect community" is born again and again, and although it may not always push us to an extreme sectarianism, it is present in many of the more subtle distortions of our evangelism, for instance, in the idea that unless we find a sacred and special Christian significance in science, mathematics, or history, we fall short of our missionary duty. We feel, somehow, that they ought to be saved from being mere worldly occupations. So we find ourselves struggling to make marriage again a Christian institution, pretending that

this would end all the problems of modern matrimony ! But we do not have to incorporate everything into the context of the Church as a phenomenon in space and time. In fact, the only way in which the Church can fight successfully for its continued existence is by fighting for the world as God wants it to be, by dying daily as an institution in its own right. The Church as a visible institution needs only that room in the world which is necessary to carry out properly its evangelistic functions. It is not there to encompass eventually all spheres of life ; it works as an agent, as a catalyst, that the world may realize the fact of its salvation.

A re-examination of the whole question of how to overcome this spatial and static thinking about the Church-world relationship is absolutely vital for our study of evangelism. If this analysis of our evangelistic encounter with modern secular man is not entirely wrong, we may have to ask ourselves whether we are not just as much contributing to the phenomenon of disintegration as we are trying to remedy it.

*What does this mean for evangelism in the Federation ?*

The following rather obvious conclusions drawn from the analysis above are meant, together with it, to provide a basis for further discussion.

1. Evangelism is an event in which the Gospel makes man realize the fact of his likeness to Christ in all realms of his life, and thereby makes him whole. Without this there is no evangelism.

2. In our evangelistic efforts we must be aware of modern man's mature feeling of autonomy and self-sufficiency in many spheres of his life, and must take this situation very seriously.

This means :

a) that the Gospel must be made relevant to these spheres, to the ruling centre in the life of modern man (whatever it may be) rather than to the borderlines of his self-sufficiency (for example, the problems of guilt and death), to his strength rather than his weakness, to what

is good and alive to him. The technique of sowing doubt in the hope of reaping faith is fatal to evangelism, for through it we further disintegration rather than remedying it.

b) that we must realize our freedom to live with Christ in a really godless world. We are free to live "worldly" in the real sense, in the likeness of Christ. We must not contribute to efforts to cover this godlessness with a kind of religious façade, by such gestures as installing a meditation room in the United Nations building. To put it even more strongly, to be a Christian does not mean to live "religiously" in all spheres of life, as people who by varying methods transform themselves into religious types: sinners, people living in a permanent act of atonement, or saints. We are simply men in the likeness of Christ, not even Christian types but real people.

3. In the same sense, evangelism is not a religious act but the whole of life in all its sober reality. The religious act, however much it may at the time involve our whole being, is only something partial. Faith and evangelism is life in all its fulness, in questions, troubles, success, failures, in tensions of disintegration which we face constructively as our share in the suffering of Christ. He took upon Himself the sin of the world instead of living as an example of perfect holiness in the eyes of religious men.

4. This evangelism demands bold action. We may be asked to lose our own identity as the particular sort of Christian whom the world knows from far off, and to enter incognito into the dangers and responsibilities of worldly life and to share it with the people who live there, in factories and laboratories, in politics and economics. We have to give up our Christian language. I am not suggesting that we cease talking about God or Christ to other people, but that we talk in a language that our modern secular — or pseudo-religious — fellow man can understand. This implies an agonisingly difficult job of translation, with the pitfalls of heresy yawning to right and to left, but it cannot be avoided.

5. We will have to study further and perhaps revise our conception of the Church-world relation, trying to find ways to overcome thinking in static terms. This study will have a direct bearing on our nature as a Student Christian Movement. It will raise such questions as : are we too wide open so that we lose not only our hitherto carefully preserved Christian identity but Christ Himself ? Are we too closed a community so that we become a self-sufficient little world just by trying to avoid that danger ?

6. We will have to continue to study what the new reality of a world under the Lordship of Christ means in all its different aspects — in science, politics, economics, church life, marriage, anthropology — but not in the hope of discovering a peculiarly Christian view of everything, but in the evangelistic enterprise of bringing them into captivity to Christ. A very important part of our student evangelism will consist of being extremely good students who put their job in the university first. For the church institutions of growing impressiveness and dwindling funds, it may mean the rethinking of the meaning of sacrifice for the sake of the world, instead of happily carrying on their evangelistic enterprises with cheques from worldly industries. Secular people financing their own conversion is quite a modern touch to evangelism.

7. Finally, let us remind ourselves that while we are worrying about evangelism, it is taking place in many places and in many ways. While we stumble over the difficulties besetting the path of the Gospel, God is keeping His promise to disintegrating mankind to manifest and fulfil the Lordship of Christ. So we have every reason not to despair, but rather to praise Him.



# The Christian in the University

PHILIP LEE-WOOLF <sup>1</sup>

Salvation depends not upon the solution of intellectual questions or of practical problems but on being held by grace in Jesus Christ. The Student Christian Movement and, ultimately, the Christian, exist to witness to that fact. But this witness is to be borne in the world. So much of our witness is poverty stricken, too narrow in scope, too much concerned with ourselves or the structures of our organizations (S.C.M.s, churches, and so forth) because we forget that God so loved the *world*, and reconciled the *world* unto Himself. Christ indeed loved the Church and gave Himself up for her as for His bride : but this love must be comprehended within God's love for the world which He made and won back to Himself in Jesus Christ.

For Christians there are no accidents, no purely chance events. So universities, even though there is not much about them directly in scripture, are not accidental and purposeless in the world. There is a will of God for them, they have significance, they have forms and structures appropriate to their purposes. In the same way, we are not accidentally students. There are, of course, various immediate reasons why we become university students — in order to qualify for a certain occupation, to acquire the prestige of being an M.A., possibly to postpone a decision about our place in the life of the world, possibly to pursue wisdom. But whatever is the immediate reason, ultimately it is under God that we study, and we are in universities to serve, to obey and to love Him. He calls us to be students and to be Christian students.

## *Our world — the university*

We are to witness to Christ in the world, and the world which God gives us as students is the university. Here misunderstanding is easy. We may suppose that we are to cut ourselves off from the rest of society : but this is impossible both because the university is itself in part a product of society

<sup>1</sup> Notes on an address delivered at the W.S.C.F. student conference at Tambaram.

and its servant (or ought to be, as it sometimes is not), and because we ourselves are not exclusively university people : we live also in other communities, other worlds. Or we may suppose that we are to cut ourselves off from the Church in its life in parish and congregation as normally understood. I believe that it is dangerous entirely to equate, to identify, the Church with its particular form and manifestation in parish and local congregation. One of the great gains of the revival of biblical theology in recent years has been to restore the understanding of the Church as integral to the Gospel and to help to re-establish the congregation as the people of God. But it is also necessary for the Church to find ways of existing as Church within structures such as colleges and factories, not only in parishes and other geographical units. Yet we should share appropriately in the life of parish and congregation, while recognizing that for us as students the university world is the primary, though not the sole, place of loyalty and witness to Christ. This is our world, our microcosm of the great world, so that the life of the Christian in the university is a small-scale instance of the Christian in the world.

There are people who become nervous about the Church, the W.S.C.F., the S.C.M. "meddling" with the university, as people object to the Church "interfering" with politics and with the world in general : and often with good reason. But even when we have admitted that there is a wrong sort of interference, we are still driven to take account of the university as a whole, its life and structure, because the ways in which subjects are taught and studied, the relations between teachers and students, the manner in which responsibility is exercised or denied, may exclude the sovereign glory of God. We are compelled to take account of the university, as we are compelled, because God confers worth on men and requires justice for them, to act in the world at large.

There are obvious examples of how in university life the glory of God may be excluded. There may be in the study of any subject the hidden assumption that men live in one dimension only, and that human life explains itself and can be fully understood without reference to the transcendent God : that there is no "mystery" of life and no inherent bias in our

ways of studying and knowing it. Or it may be taken for granted that knowledge is something possessed by the teacher to be handed on to the student, an assumption that shuts men in on themselves and denies that both teacher and student stand under the Lord in whose fear is the beginning of wisdom.

Thus wherever the university claims absoluteness, complete sovereignty, for itself, the Christian's interest in the university arises from his inescapable evangelistic task. Jesus is Lord also of the university and His Lordship must be made known within it.

It is easy for a university to suppose that it is a community when in fact it is not. There is usually of course a certain degree of fellow-feeling, so that we are downhearted when "we lose the boat-race". But for its fundamental purpose — research, teaching, learning, study — very often there is no more than a collection of people and disciplines using the same buildings. This tendency to disintegration is accelerated, as is widely remarked, by specialization and by the imperialism in which one subject tries to take over the field of another. Here then is a Christian task, among teachers as well as pupils, to hold together in conversation and interaction, through grace which overcomes separation: not sentimentally, but so that humbly, honestly and deeply the truth may be sought in the meeting of men and subjects otherwise isolated from each other.

It is easy also to proceed on the assumption that reason is impartial and hence that "science" is ideologically and religiously neutral. There is no space here but to say dogmatically that on the contrary every concrete science contains a hidden answer to the question, "What is man?" For example, in medicine it is becoming clear that, whatever can be done with blood counts, x-rays, and so forth, the doctor deals basically with the whole man and in terms of his own understanding of the nature of man. So, in reality, there is in the university a struggle of views about man and the nature of human life.

This is not news to the Christian, who should never have believed in the "unconditioned" "pure reason": for he should always have recognized reason as a function of the whole person, itself socially conditioned, and as involved in the sinfulness of the person.

*What is the Christian do to ?*

All this may make the university sound to be in a bad way, confused beyond hope. It is in fact not more so, and often less so, than the world at large. What is the Christian to do ?

First, he should give himself faithfully to his own subject. What has been said about the partiality and fragmentariness of reason is no more cause for abandoning or decrying it than the fact that we do not produce a perfect social order is reason for abandoning the pursuit of justice in society. As Jesus Christ is Truth, we are to set up signs in the university world of His kingdom of truth. The search for truth is the prime obedience of the Christian, even though we know that Christ judges our apprehensions of the truth. So not jobs, not prestige, not victory in argument, but loyalty to truth as it finds us makes being a student worth while. Integrity is the mark of the good student, as of the good teacher.

Second, the Christian participates in the full life of the university, in its communities, clubs and societies. He participates primarily in order to help the societies fulfil their own proper function. A rowing club is not an evangelistic meeting but aims at producing good rowers. Of course, it may be necessary to challenge the assumptions, biasses, patterns of behaviour, in these very societies in the name of the real, though hidden, sovereignty of Christ. And here there may arise a genuine dialogue of belief with unbelief. Nevertheless, the first task is to see that the societies and clubs fulfil their own good human purposes.

Third, the Christian manner of life in the university, as outside, is humble. The world he studies is majestic and mysterious ; its truth and meaning are warped and broken as he grasps them, for he is a sinner : the Lord Christ is behind and over the truth of all, including his opponents in debate. For all these reasons he must lay himself humbly open — to his subject-matter and its claim on him, to his colleague and opponent for help and correction. This is necessary indeed not only for finding the truth in the subject, but also for the integrity of our faith. How can we say, "This is the victory", if we do not expose our faith to the battle of ideas and ideologies in the world ?

And, fourth, the Christian looks for ways in which the



confession of Jesus Christ may become indigenous to the university environment, may become incarnate in words and ways which belong to this sphere. Without this search we are as foreign missionaries who make no attempt to learn the language and to understand the mind of the people to whom they are sent ; and the praise of Christ simply cannot be spoken as a foreign thing. It must be indigenous, even though in trying to make it so we risk transforming it into something else. In changing its form we may lose its content. The attempt, however, must be made : hence the value of forms of worship and prayer (for example, the British S.C.M.'s *Student Prayer*) specially chosen for students.

### *A Christian community*

These obligations of the Christian student need the support of an S.C.M. community which is a genuine fellowship. True community is possible, finally, only on a basis of forgiveness, of the divine forgiveness in the Cross breaking the impasse of our conceit and anxiety and consequent self-isolation. The word of the Cross can create a community of love in forgiveness within the broken fellowship of university life. Such a community, in being bound together by a love coming from beyond itself, testifies to the fact that our efforts to win wisdom and love defeat themselves from within, and to the fact that in Christ God has overcome our defeat.

Further, a Christian community, a true S.C.M., points to Jesus Christ, and is thus a sign that the university is not a law to itself, that its truth and wisdom is limited by the Truth as it is in Jesus Christ, that it is answerable to Him for its dealings with truth and with the persons who seek truth.

To say that an S.C.M. is to be a genuine community grounded in God's forgiving love, and that it is a standing sign of the Kingship of Christ, is to say something tremendous. All over the world there are small S.C.M. branches, tiny groups struggling with difficulties of time and circumstance and inadequate leadership. We ought to marvel at the splendid status which has been conferred on them, that they are to be the sign in their own place that Jesus Christ is Lord. But it is a realization which liberates ; for the ghetto-mind is banished in remembering that God has chosen the weak of the world to confound the mighty.

# Church and Mission

VALDO GALLAND <sup>1</sup>

## *The Church as the continuation of Israel*

According to the New Testament, the Church is a continuation of the people of Israel. The same names and expressions which are used in the Old Testament to characterize them, in the New are applied to the Church. The Greek word *ecclesia*, which in the New Testament always refers to the Church, is a translation of the Hebrew term *qahal*, which means the people's assembly called by God. In his epistle to Titus Paul uses the phrase, "a people of his own"; the same expression is used for Israel in Deuteronomy 7 : 6. Peter, in his first epistle (2 : 9), addresses Christians as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation". Paul goes so far as to speak of the Church as "the Israel of God" (Galatians 6 : 16) and of the Christians as "Abraham's offsprings" (Galatians 3 : 29). James refers to the Church as "the twelve tribes" (1 : 1). This continuity between the people of Israel and the Church was suggested by Christ Himself when he chose His apostles, the future Church, according to the number of the tribes of Israel.

As the continuation of Israel, the Church is therefore the people set aside by God as belonging to Him, and entirely consecrated to His service, the people through whom He carries out His plan to restore fallen creation. This people is not elected for its own benefit, but for the blessing of all other people, for the Lord of the universe is not satisfied with the obedience of one group of men : He is preparing the coming of His Kingdom where all mankind will freely recognize His merciful Lordship. The role of the chosen people in God's plan for the salvation of the world is made clear in the story of the calling of Abraham, the father of the chosen people : "By you all the families of the earth will bless themselves" (Genesis 12 : 3).

<sup>1</sup> An address delivered at the W.S.C.F. student conference at Tambaram.

*The newness of the Church*

While the New Testament describes the Church as a continuation of the people of Israel, it also teaches that it is something entirely new. The Church, in the strict sense of the word, begins at Pentecost when Christ's disciples, gathered together in the same house, received the Holy Spirit. Before that day the disciples' community was only potentially the Church. Afterward it was really the Church, conscious of its mission, no longer retiring and fearful, but speaking with assurance to other men, exhorting them to accept God's salvation.

To understand that the Church which is born of the gift of the Holy Spirit is something new, we must appreciate the extraordinary nature of that Spirit at Pentecost. It was different from the Spirit before Pentecost. According to Peter's speech to the crowd, the Holy Spirit which came upon the disciples was the same which the prophet Joel had prophesied for the last days. Moreover, says Peter, Jesus dispensed this Spirit which He received from the Father. This Jesus of Nazareth, crucified by the Jews, was raised from the dead by God, who elevated Him to sovereignty and gave Him lordship over the whole world. What does this mean? It is the proclamation of the mysterious accomplishment of the world's redemption. The assurance of the new-born Church is that if Jesus was accepted by God to the extent that He became Lord of the world, it was because Christ Himself, through His life and death, was the sacrifice which satisfied God's justice, which had been offended by man's sin. In Jesus Christ God reconciled the world to Himself. This is why the Spirit of Pentecost was so completely new, why, according to the apostles, it was the Spirit of the last days. From Pentecost onward, the Holy Spirit was no longer the Spirit of a painfully-offended God, but of a God at peace with the world, whose justice had been satisfied and who was reconciled with His creation.

The something new about the Church, its fundamental difference from the people of Israel, was that the latter expected reconciliation, while the Church lives by the reconciliation accomplished in Jesus Christ. The Church is the community of

those who have received the Spirit of Pentecost, who live in the joyful assurance that Jesus Christ has obtained their salvation and reconciled them with God, and that He is the Lord of the world. The Church is God's people in this intermediate time in which the old and new eras somehow overlap — the time which the prophets called "the last days", which extends from the accomplishment of redemption to the manifestation of Christ's glory.

### *The essence of the Church*

The essence of the Church, which proceeds from the work of reconciliation in Jesus Christ, is made clear in the New Testament use of the Greek term *koinonia*, which means communion, participation. It is used to describe both the relationship between believers and that between believers and God. On the contrary, in the Old Testament the Hebrew word which is its equivalent is applied only to the horizontal relationship between man and man: the absolute guilt, which had not yet been wiped out, created an abyss between God and man. In the New Testament the abyss has been closed by the incarnation and the guilt has been wiped out by the atonement. Because of Christ there is now *koinonia*, complete communion between men and God.

This New Testament use of *koinonia* to describe the vertical relationship between man and God, is an indication of the force of the word when it is applied to the horizontal relationship between believers themselves. Communion between men depends on their communion with God: "... if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with one another" (I John 1: 7). The Church is constituted by this intense *koinonia*. Paul uses the image of the body to describe the essence of the Church. When referring to the vertical communion, he speaks of the Body of which Christ is the Head, and with reference to the horizontal communion, he speaks of the Body of Christ constituted by believers.

The Church is *koinonia*. All believers form a Body in Christ. There is no room for individualistic Christians, unconcerned about the Church. There are many who say, "Jesus Christ, yes, but the Church is of no value." It is true that



such a reaction usually results from the fact that what on earth is called the church lacks true *koinonia*. But the Church cannot be understood from its earthly reality, but from the redeeming act accomplished by Jesus Christ. If a Christian consistently deprecates the Church, his understanding of Christ's work and person can legitimately be questioned. Probably such a Christian is among those who see in Jesus the Master, but not the Saviour of the world who has already accomplished our salvation.

This does not imply that our Student Christian Movements should not be open to non-church Christians. An S.C.M. is not a church, and its doors must be open to all those who search for truth, whatever their opinions. But an S.C.M. must work towards an understanding of the importance of the Church according to the will of God, so that every Christian will become a church member.

A second consequence of the fact that *koinonia* is the essence of the Church is that human forms of the Church are of secondary importance. In other words, neither liturgy, nor sacraments, nor doctrines, nor confessions of faith constitute the Church. Rather, where there is *koinonia*, there worship and sacraments will be faithfully celebrated, doctrine and confession of faith correctly formulated. Moreover, the external appearance of the Church can and must change according to circumstances. But the *koinonia* does not change, and where there is no *koinonia*, there is no Church.

### *The Church and the churches*

Such an understanding of the essence of the Church allows no questioning of the fact that there is only one Church. All those who are united with Christ are united together. As there is only one God, one Spirit and one Christ, so there is only one Church. During His ministry among men, Jesus Himself said, "I shall build my church", not "my churches". This Church is unique and therefore catholic, embracing all believers. It is not a reality which man can define but a matter of faith.

But according to the New Testament, this reality, though undefinable in its totality, is fully manifested on the local level. Local congregations are called churches: the church

which is at Jerusalem, at Rome, at Corinth, at Philippi, and so on. This is true because the Church is wherever there is *koinonia*, and because there is *koinonia* wherever "two or three are gathered in the name of Jesus Christ". The Church as such is a paradox. There is only one Church, yet there are as many churches as there are places where Christians gather together. In other words, each local church is fully a church, and at the same time a part of the whole Church. A local church which is satisfied with its own existence and not concerned with the whole Church throughout the world, ceases to be the Church. This also applies to groups of churches who come together in regional, national or area organizations. This is why synods, bishops and councils, or, in our modern world, regional and world conferences are so important, for through them the churches which are geographically separated come to know and love one another better.

This paradox of the one Church and the multiplicity of churches is related to the previous point that there is no room for Christian individualism. Since the Church is at the same time the catholic Church and the local church, when we speak of the Christian as having to be a church member, we mean not only a member of the Church Universal but very concretely of the local church in the place where he lives.

### *Divisions of the Church*

We have thus far spoken of the Church from the viewpoint of faith, but we cannot ignore its earthly reality, and when we look at this we see the multiplicity of different organizations which call themselves churches. Often they ignore, despise, or even fight one another. There are two ways to deny the reality of this division. According to some, and this is the position of the Roman Catholics and of several sects, the Church is not divided, because it truly exists only in this or that ecclesiastical body. Those who are not members of this body are not members of the Church of Christ. We cannot accept this position because the distinguishing characteristic of any such body is either doctrinal formulation or ecclesiastical discipline, and the Church is not constituted by dogma or government but by *koinonia*.

The other denial is through the spiritual conception of unity. Never mind about different denominations, we are told. Everyone has a right to choose the church which he finds most congenial. The only important thing is to be spiritually united. Such talk is completely unrealistic; it does not correspond to the facts. When two neighbours go in opposite directions to worship the Lord, their differences are stronger than this so-called spiritual unity, and when in an ecumenical conference delegates cannot meet around the Lord's Table, it means real division.

How then can we explain that the one Church is divided? The historical division between East and West in the eleventh century, the divisions provoked in the sixteenth century by the Reformation, the monstrous fragmentation of Protestantism during the last two hundred years, the sin of the world in which Christians are still involved because they live at a time when the era of the new creation still overlaps with the old — none of these explains the paradoxical fact of the division of the one Church, one in spite of our division. This division is absurd and scandalous, and we cannot avoid facing it when we live in the *koinonia* of Jesus Christ, especially we Christian students who take part in interconfessional associations or meetings, where we discover that we share in the same *koinonia* with members of churches which are not in communion with our own.

### *Our ecumenical task*

What should we do when we become conscious of the scandal of church divisions? We should not work to create the unity of the Church, for we cannot create what already exists without denying its very existence. Instead we have to live this unity completely — in our towns and cities, in our nations, in the world. We have to fight against our divisions, to throw down the barriers which separate us. Then the unity of the Church will become manifest, even to those outside it. Then non-Christians will be able to say again of Christians: "See how they love one another."

We must therefore participate in the ecumenical movement, which for more than half a century has worked for the *rappro-*

*chement* of the churches, for the manifestation of as complete unity of the Church as is possible. Participation in the ecumenical movement does not consist only of membership in an S.C.M. or in the Federation, for this does not necessarily make us ecumenical. But we, our S.C.M.s, our Federation will be instruments of ecumenism if we are conscious of the necessity to manifest the essential unity of the Church, and if we are convinced of the importance of the Church in the will of God and of the necessity to throw down the barriers which divide us.

There are two main lines which must be followed in all efforts towards church reunion. In the first place, we must constantly remember that the Holy Spirit which created the Church on the day of Pentecost is still at work. If this were not so, communion with Jesus Christ would not be possible and there would be no Church. This continued action of the Holy Spirit means that the Church cannot be static, either in the way in which it confesses its faith or in the way in which it lives. No church reunion can be achieved through a simple return to the past, but only when the uniting churches are truly concerned to be faithful here and now.

In the second place, we must take into account the continuity of the Church, which is part of its unity. If, in spite of the great cosmic event of Easter, the Church is the continuation of Israel, it is even more the continuation of itself, in spite of the divisions caused by man. If no church reunion can be achieved by a return to the past, neither can it come through ignoring it. Each church must recognize what it has received from God during the time of division (for even in our sinful state God blesses us). It is through such blessings that the continuity of the Church of Jesus Christ has been manifested within all our churches, even in those which have been least conscious of it. It is the existence of these gifts of God which has given rise within the ecumenical movement to the desire to preserve the characteristics of each confession. But confessionalism will be valid only in so far as the gifts of grace to each denomination are actualized here and now and not preserved in their past form. Only thus will the different churches be able to share all their gifts of grace in order to constitute one single Church richly blessed.



### *The primary mission of the Church*

When we speak of ecumenism, we speak of the mission of the Church, because the search for full communion among Christians proceeds directly from being in communion with God, living as belonging to Him, which is our first great duty and task. In other words, the mission of the Church is to glorify God, to acknowledge His sovereignty and lordship, and to know and obey His will. Jesus Christ Himself told His disciples: "Seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be yours as well" (Matt. 6 : 33).

The book of Acts tells how the primitive Church carried out this mission. The disciples "devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2 : 42). Here are the elements of full worship which is the first mission of each local congregation : preaching, which is either an explanation or application of the apostles' doctrine which we find in the Bible as a whole, offering or sharing of material goods to meet the needs of the brotherhood, celebration of the Holy Communion, and prayer. It is not surprising that the ecumenical movement, which is concerned with the *koinonia*, has contributed to the mutual enrichment of churches in the celebration of worship. Orthodox churches have rediscovered the importance of preaching, and Protestant churches the significance of sacramental life. But just as in true worship the Church is oriented towards God, on whom it is entirely dependent, so later it is sent back into the world with concrete instructions. In other words, worship is the first, but not the full, mission of the Church.

### *Further mission of the Church*

This further mission proceeds from our communion with the saving God who has already reconciled us unto Himself through His Son, and has given us a time of waiting between Christ's resurrection and His coming in glory, during which He is extending His salvation throughout the whole world, for as Paul says, He "desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. 2 : 4). When we are in communion

with God, we will what He wills and do what He does. Thus the Church is involved in the saving work of God : it is the apostle, the envoy, the ambassador of God in the world. From this we should not conclude that the Church takes the place of the absent Christ ; it is not the ambassador of an absent sovereign, but the witness of the secret but effective presence of the risen Christ who has become Lord of the world. This mission is what the New Testament calls "proclaiming the good news" — evangelism. We have only to proclaim it, and not to search for it as other men do, for it already exists : men are already reconciled with God.

Two things are essential in carrying out our evangelistic task. The first is that we proclaim with complete fidelity the message from which we live and which has been entrusted to us. We cannot add to it or take away from it to make it more acceptable. If we did, it would not be evangelism but the worst form of proselytism. We would be trying to convert people, whereas we have simply to proclaim the good news so that they may be converted by Christ Himself. We are only witnesses : we are not defenders.

The second requirement is that we recognize our solidarity with the world, which belongs to Jesus Christ. We cannot preach the Gospel with an attitude of superiority : we need it as much as do those to whom we preach. We are still part of the old world of sin and death, and must know the situation of our neighbour in order to proclaim the Gospel to him in the most relevant and understandable way possible. To use Paul's expression, we must "make ourselves all things to all men".

These two things, the purity of the Gospel and the relevance of the message, are inseparable. "The Church's witness will be concrete only if it is pure ; it will be pure only if it is concrete." The same is true of the two tasks of the Church. We cannot speak of the Church as only a true community, or say that it must be only missionary. The Church is the Church only if it is both at the same time. It is a true community only if it is missionary ; it is missionary only if it is a true community.

*Home and foreign missions*

The divine message which creates the Church is characterized by the fact that it can be kept only in so far as it is shared with others. This means that the Church must constantly go out of itself and cross its own frontiers. Each local church will work at evangelizing the place where it is set. At the same time, it will collaborate with those churches with which it is connected in a national church in evangelization wherever in the nation the Gospel has not yet been proclaimed, or where a new generation has rejected it. No church has the right to evangelize abroad if it does not do so at home. But the Church is called by the Gospel to go beyond its own borders, and it cannot be unconcerned for evangelization abroad, under the pretext that at home it is unfinished or too weak. We must today recognize that there is no essential difference between home and foreign missions; they are still distinguished from one another only because there are still national borders. And if home missions has some priority, it is only a very relative one. A church which is concerned only with evangelism within its own nation is one which is losing the sense of the universality of the Gospel and is becoming incapable of evangelism. But the church which gives itself and everything it has is one which receives and grows richer. This is evident in the ecumenical movement, which has enriched and will continue to enrich Western churches, and which is nothing but the fruit of the missionary movement; it is in fact on the mission fields that the churches have discovered the acuteness, the enormity of the scandal of division.

In the case of foreign missions, the mission coming from a church must produce a church. We cannot undertake a missionary task for its own sake, but in order that another church may be born and grow in another part of the world. As a result of the modern missionary movement, we find today that in almost all countries there are established churches, and our ecumenical consciousness prevents us from creating a church, even in completely pagan territory, without the previous agreement of the church established in that country. The question therefore arises of whether we should not change our

language and our practice, for instance, substituting for "boards of foreign missions" the expression "boards of aid to churches abroad". The purpose of missions should not be so much to send missionaries abroad for direct evangelism (though there is still room for this sort of work), but to send the specialists which other churches need to become truly indigenous and missionary. The missionary movement thus regarded is no longer a one-way traffic from Europe and North America to Africa, Asia and Latin America, but a matter of mutual exchange.

### *Prayer and social action*

Evangelization, the proclamation of the good news, always goes together with prayer and social action. If we took a little more seriously the fundamental fact that the destiny of our nations and of the world hangs upon the prayer of the Church, how powerful would be the witness which would follow our intercession, made with that conviction, for the world and the missionary work in it. And this brings us back to the central place of worship — the primary mission of the Church.

The social work of the Church is necessary to evangelism as a confirmation of its message of love. It may be that the Church can serve society through instruments of its own — colleges, hospitals, rural service and so on. It may also be — and this is more and more often the case — that the state takes responsibility for all such activities. The Church will then concentrate its social action upon its members as they are involved in the world. If need be, it will train them, through a special ministry, for instance as priest-workmen, in order that as laymen they can make their profession a living witness. The Church must not lament when the state takes over the responsibility for social work which it has initiated; it must simply find new forms of social witness and entrust them to its members in the world. This shows immediately the importance of S.C.M. work, where the future doctor can prepare to be a Christian doctor, the engineer to be a Christian engineer, the professor a Christian professor. This is preparation to be missionaries, either in the country where God has put them or in another, to help the Church of Jesus Christ there to be faithful to its mission.



# **THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE**

## **KOTTAYAM IMPRESSIONS**

*At the final sessions of the World Conference of Christian Youth at Kottayam, Travancore, India, in December, 1952, some delegations presented statements on the significance of this meeting. We have thought it valuable to publish these, pointing out that they are not official declarations of any particular country, church or organization, but only informal statements by some of the delegates who took part in this conference.*

### **A Statement by the American Delegation**

#### **CONCERNING OUR FAITH**

The theme of the conference has been, "Christ the Answer". By our very coming together we testified to our faith in the uniqueness and centrality of Christ in our world. Indeed, so great a faith in His uniqueness did we embrace that we came expecting to find in Him the answers to all our questions. The new light of the conference, however, was the understanding that Christ is the Answer to God's questions, questions far more fundamental than those discussed in the ordinary intercourse of human society. God's eternal questions to the prodigal human soul — "Where art thou?" and "Who say ye that I am?" — find their answers in the crucified and risen Christ. It is in this faith that we can venture forth to solve our human problems in the confidence that He who has begun a good work in us will bring it to completion.

#### **CONCERNING OUR NATION**

For many weeks preceding the conference the members of the delegation travelled in countries of both the East and West. Against this background and the international fellowship of the conference, we have often been privileged to see our nation as others see it. The experience has stimulated these general observations:

That Americans need to use their freedom of communication with most of the world to learn more about the people of that world and their problems.

That our fear of communism, at home and abroad, stems more often from blind opposition than adequate knowledge of its hold and its fatal weakness. We need to see communism through the eyes of those to whom it is making its strongest appeal. Especially do we need to understand the reasons for the strength of this appeal in countries like India where the problem of widespread poverty may have to be solved by methods which are unfamiliar to our national traditions.

That the United States should play a responsible role in world affairs but must not expect to have all the answers to world problems. For us responsibility involves, on the one hand, responding to the will of God in seeking the welfare of all people, and, on the other, recognition that we continually fall short of this ideal. We must be prepared to learn from other nations as we deal with them politically and economically ; to recognize the compromises into which we are forced by our own ignorance and the difficulties of situations, and to see the suffering which our policies can cause other people. The plight of Arab refugees is one example of compromise and suffering involved in political decisions. We must exercise our power with continual humility and repentance, even though our antagonists exercise their power otherwise.

#### CONCERNING THE CHURCH

The Church can find its life and its unity only in dedication to its mission. In Asia we have met vital Christian concern for evangelism and the visible unity of the Church. We have noted how the two concerns belong together.

We feel that the ecumenical movement is further justified by what we have to learn from each other. Here in Kottayam we have often seen the best in one another and have found God speaking to us in the life and work of Christians, who, until now, have been unknown to us.

The foundations of the Church and its ecumenical expression are the redemptive fellowships in the local community. In particular we feel that interconfessional groups of Christians should devote more time to common Bible study and the prayerful sharing of their faith. Here at Kottayam we have sometimes differed over biblical interpretation, but in the midst of the study we have discovered new depths of unity. The depths of our faith drew us together, not the least common denominator. We are convinced that the imperative for participation in the ecumenical movement is rooted in the fact that we are all reconciled to God through one Lord and Saviour — and that God is concerned for the whole community of life. We note that in an ecumenical setting we are forced to look at the whole

of life. The conference has been unable to avoid the discussion of economic and political issues. The wholeness of the Church must be recovered if the Church is to minister to the whole of life.

To the Christian youth of the United States we bring these concerns in this unofficial statement.

### **A Statement by an Orthodox Delegate**

I have lived in this conference as a member of the Orthodox Church and I would like to tell you about it from that point of view. In fact I cannot do it in any other way.

The foremost feeling in my mind is one of thankfulness. I am thankful for the real Christian fellowship we had at the conference, as we lived together and faced together many of the problems which exercise our minds. It is a matter of particular joy to me that this conference took place in Kottayam, which is the seat of the most ancient church in this land, the Syrian Church, where I feel quite at home. The opportunities we had to see the Church at work in this part of the world and to take part in the Eastern ways of worship in the local churches, have been a great experience for me and, I hope, for all of us. I am sure that the visits of the delegates to the parishes was a unique experience. We could not have had that in many other places. The conference has helped me not only to understand a little more about the mental climate of the non-Orthodox, but to come into closer fellowship with other parts of the Eastern churches. I am hopeful that conferences of this nature will bring us ever closer together, strengthening our bonds of faith and fellowship.

I am conscious that this conference has given me a new awareness of our Christian responsibility in social, economic, and political spheres, and not merely in the spiritual sphere. I feel now that in these matters there can and should be a more real coming together of the Christian youth of all churches.

If I might pin-point what I learned from my contacts with other confessions at the conference, I would say that I think that we Orthodox should add to the corporate aspect of faith and life in the Church the individual and personal aspects emphasized in Protestant traditions. The latter should not be neglected, though it will be dangerous if it receives an over-emphasis. The faith is the faith of the whole Church, but the individual has to make it his own.

It seems to me that it was very wise to limit the number of delegates to this conference. In a bigger conference one gets lost! This has been a working conference because we could function in groups of convenient size.

As a member of the Orthodox Church I think that we should strengthen our bonds with the ecumenical movement. It is important that the Orthodox should be fully represented in ecumenical thinking, organization and action, as otherwise there will be the danger of ecumenical thinking going off at a tangent. I must confess that I did feel sometimes at this conference that the Protestant basis of thought and planning was taken for granted by many people here. Probably it would not have been so if some of the eminent Orthodox leaders had been available at the conference. Occasionally one almost got the feeling that the Orthodox point of view struck a note of disharmony. This is not to suggest, however, that without it there would inevitably have been harmony. Probably some such conflict is to be expected, for the Orthodox point of view on most things is distinctive. In the matter of church union, for example, we cannot think of any union except on the unity of faith and doctrine. We would emphasize a historical perspective in this matter and a going back to the faith and practices of the Church of the early centuries. We are not so much anxious to discover a minimum of common faith as to preserve the plenitude or wholeness of the faith "once delivered to the saints" treasured in the living tradition of the Church. The Church's task of witness and evangelism is divinely given; but the Church is more than its mission. Exigencies in the mission field, geographical or otherwise, cannot be to us a ground for doctrinal liberties. Again, the Orthodox cannot understand the term intercommunion. There is only the communion within the Church. Holy Communion is to be the expression of a realized unity and not the means to unity. Otherwise it amounts to sacrilege. I am pointing out these, not to advertise Orthodox goods, but to indicate why the Orthodox thinks differently.

In conclusion I would say that I shall be trying in all ways possible to pass on the message and meaning of this conference to me, to the rank and file of our church. It has opened up new vistas for me and I hope it will for our church.

May the Saints of God rejoice in our efforts to work out God's purpose for us and our churches in this world.

May God bless us.

MARIE NASSIF  
(Lebanon)



## **A Statement by the Latin American Delegates**

At the end of the third World Conference of Christian Youth, we feel that we have to state for our own sake as well as for our brethren in all parts of the world what is the attitude that the Gospel calls forth from us.

1. We came here with a lot of questions regarding what our Christian obedience should be in the present world situation. What we have learned together is:

(a) When we expect a system, a doctrine or principles which will enable us to overcome communism, capitalism or the tensions arising from their antagonism, Jesus Christ does not give us answers to the questions we raise.

(b) Jesus does not countersign plans invented by men whereby they believe they can save the world; He did not come in order to endorse ideas, but to save men.

(c) In our divided world we tend to call our side good and the other evil. Jesus Christ does not endorse such judgments.

2. We have also learned together from Jesus Christ that He wants to liberate us from what is at the root of all tensions in this world: egoism, hatred and fear.

(a) Because Jesus Christ and He only is the Truth, we are compelled to give up imposing our national, cultural and political truths on our fellow men, whom we are called to love.

(b) Because Jesus Christ and He only is Love, we cannot hate men who do not think and do not live as we do; we resist the incitement to hatred provoked by political propaganda.

(c) Because Jesus Christ and He only is Peace, we cannot fear any man, any ideology, any people.

3. We have received together from Jesus Christ the ministry of reconciliation, and the assurance that He will give us day by day as we meet men the concrete ways in which to express our faithfulness; therefore, although we do not know today what we shall have to do tomorrow, we have the joyful assurance that Jesus Christ will guide us step by step.

## De Universitate

### STUDENT DILEMMAS

*Some of the early sessions of the W.S.C.F. General Committee meeting at Nasrapur, India, were devoted to a description by some of the delegates of the problems being faced by our Student Christian Movements and their members in several parts of the world. It is only by accepting such challenges and by finding a way to present the Christian message within and to such situations, that Student Christian Movements can carry on their task of witness. Unfortunately it is not possible to reproduce here all the statements made in these panel meetings, nor are we able to present a record of the very stimulating discussions which they provoked. However, what follows will give readers of The Student World some understanding of the difficulties being met by the present student generation.*

### In Rural Asia

MATHAI ZACHARIAH

(India)

A conflict exists in the heart and mind of Asia today, which is a conflict between "rural Asia, the real Asia" and the Asia which is eager to adapt itself, or has already adapted itself, to the influx of Western ideas and techniques. We literally "live between two worlds, one dead and the other powerless to be born". Most of the problems we are facing can be traced back to this basic conflict.

Gone are the days when, cut off from the rest of the world, the Asian student could lead a life of comparative obscurity and ease. Today he is thrown into the arena of world tensions, and his problems cannot be fully understood apart from the ideological conflict in which he is involved.

Although Asia is predominantly rural, we find that most of the universities are situated in urban areas. From the moment a student joins the university, he has to cut himself off from his village moorings and root his life in the atmosphere of the city. His whole training during the next few years is directed towards life in the city, whereas it ought to be centred in the village where he is actually needed. Consequently few students like to return to their villages after completing their university training. Life in the city is easier, happier,

and not weighed down by the dull monotony of the village. The Radhakrishnan Commission on Higher Education in India has recommended that the course of wisdom in the present circumstances is to create the type of educational opportunity appropriate to Indian rural life. The Commission, therefore, suggested the formation of Rural Universities modelled on the Danish People's Colleges and Gandhiji's basic education plans.

The war years and those immediately following were a period of national upheaval and phenomenal change in most Asian countries. In India, for example, student strikes were a common occurrence during those years, and in some of the other countries war has unsettled the students' life for a long time. It is interesting to note how permanent are some of the effects of this unsettled period on both the individual and community life of students.

Many students, having lost an appreciation of the ethical basis of human life and social relationships, seem to forget that knowledge is in the end useless unless it is anchored to moral and religious purposes. Most of our students are a technical success but a cultural failure. Their only aim is a good degree and a well-paid job. As a result of the present eagerness for scientific education and the need for it in the economically-backward countries of Asia, a large group of technicians without culture has arisen. Although they have a knowledge of the means, they have no insight into the ends, and since Asia is moving fast in the direction of the technological age due to the impact of the West, no definition has been made of the morality of this new age.

Next to Marxism, indifference to religion and morality is the dominant ideology among students. It is a subtle opponent, as a student remarked, because it does not deliver a frontal attack upon Christianity, but rather by-passes it as of little consequence in the twentieth century. This has often encouraged Christian students to withdraw into their ivory tower, "for the adversary does not seem to be going about as a roaring lion".

Many students in our colleges — and their number is growing — have frankly given up trying to make sense of the world. They are content to live unto the day and are willing to take responsibility only for themselves. They maintain an attitude of cynical indifference to all exhortations to rise above themselves, and are mostly unwilling to face different philosophies of life in an objective way. It is a formidable task to introduce these young men and women to a hope and significance in life which rest upon sure foundations.

The cultural failure of our education is reflected in our students. In recent years they have been largely apathetic, they have had no wide

interests or compelling convictions, and the actively-minded minority has often been in revolt and could therefore not be made to do anything constructive. Students tend to feel that they are living in a world different from that of their teachers — a world which is grimmer and less secure economically, politically and morally. They are met by teachers whom they do not understand and who do not understand their problems. They hunger for leadership, and if they find a prophet at all, he is often found outside the university.

The students' frustration, due to social and university conditions, makes them an easy prey for those who profess to have a dogmatic ideology, and added to this, the splits in student organizations, their factionalism and competition for power, occupy the time of the best among them. As a result student life today is dominated by thugs or *gundas* who neither believe, know nor learn anything.

The urgent problem facing Christian students today is not the age-old one of living in the midst of a predominantly non-Christian community, but among people who challenge his faith in the light of the new dogmas which claim the total loyalty of man. This assumes an added significance in Asia because in many of its countries the social revolution is long overdue. The Christian student who does not really know his own faith is therefore the right material for the ideologist wishing to preach a revolutionary gospel.

The traditional Asian religions are rejected with an ease which is terrifying to the older generation, but the hunger for religion remains, resulting all too easily in the worship of false gods. Many students have gone over to the revolutionary forces because they are finding there, and only there, that sense of integration and promise of leadership lacking in the Church.

The total effect of all these factors has been that the student does not know by what standard his actions will finally be judged, or whether there is any standard at all. The Marxist has projected into this vacuum his own extremely dogmatic doctrine, which stresses that the standard of judgment is the "developing social process itself", that a thing is right if it is ultimately successful. This means that in the end the question, "What is right?" becomes "Who has the most powerful and ruthless will to succeed?"

Our present condition is in part due to the failure of our education to cope with the moral and spiritual uncertainties of our times. The Asian student needs a hierarchy of values which will give meaning and direction to his college work as he moves from class to class. Above all, he must be recalled to morality and personal values which ought to be the basis of the community life of the university.



## **In the Newly-independent Countries of Asia**

LEO RADJA HABA

(Indonesia)

Indonesian students, Christian and non-Christian, have gone through one form of revolution or another, and they have not come out of it unaffected. There has been a rush of destructive events which have followed one another in rapid succession, and as a crowning of the movement there has come national and political independence. This newly-achieved independence, regarded as an end in itself, has proved to be only the beginning of the revolutionary process of consolidation and construction, and there is now the rush to implement the newly-created status.

The students have been involved in these two complementary elements of the revolution, and the mood in which they have lived and continue to live is one of blind activism and helpless passivism, both the result of the rush of events which has created uneasiness in their minds, at the same time forcing them to seek for a dynamic instability.

In the university the student rushes from one examination to the next in order to get his degree within the required time. His mind is the battleground of confused ideas, and in the bad housing conditions which exist, ideal family life is out of reach.

I remember vividly a conversation I had with a medical student, who said: "It is very hard to see behind the lectures anything more than the gathering of intellectual knowledge. It is hard to discern the hand and voice of God among so many human hands and voices. What we need is prayer, silent meditation and Bible reading as a fixed part of our daily program." Living in a very busy and noisy environment, this student gets up early in the morning in order to have a quiet hour of prayer, Bible reading and meditation, because she considers her private religious life to be essential in her search for an integrated personality.

I also remember a discussion at the W.S.C.F. Leadership Training Course in Djokjakarta on what is a "good student". We concluded that he is many things, but primarily he is a person who can be creative in the overwhelmingly confusing society of today, in guiding people to think and act clearly.

Students are looking for an ideal, for a dynamic revolutionary motivation to meet the revolutionary spirit of the time. Christian

students worthy of that name find it in their faith and confession that "Jesus Christ is Lord of the Church and of the world". But it is fair to say that it is at this very point that serious doubt begins for many students, doubt as to the Lordship of Jesus Christ in the world. They feel that the Church and the world live from two different sources, the Church from Jesus Christ and the world from something quite unrelated. Faith, they believe, can be applied only to the Church, and they must resort to something different for the world. Students moulded in the too-intellectual atmosphere of the university are inclined to rely completely on the power of knowledge as such. At best they consider faith and intellect as parallel factors, at worst, as enemies. It would be unfair to say that they deny that national upbuilding is a matter of the individual and of the spirit, but there is a striking over-emphasis on material development. Theology is the stepchild of science ; philosophy and literature are neglected children. The ambition of many young men is to become doctors, engineers, economists, lawyers, for the cry is : give us more bridges, more ships and airplanes, more capable leaders !

Students have participated actively in the revolution in Indonesia, sometimes as leaders. I myself have several times heard in youth conferences an appeal to students to keep always in mind their intimate, personal relationship with the "lower" classes in society. This is true of all countries and all students : study with this appeal in mind ! But there is here a possible danger. It is important always to take into consideration the spirit in which students understand the word "leadership". It is a fact that, in the life of a Student Christian Movement, it is only the students who have some responsibility on committees who are active, and they relax into passivity as soon as they are relieved of it. Then the question arises : is leadership understood only in terms of exercising influence and power, and not in terms of consciousness of responsibility ? Revolution has been experienced primarily as a seizure of power. Who is going to transform the minds of the students who have been so impressed by the revolution and moulded in a society which is always fighting for something, for anything ?

In this situation Christianity has a message. But as one of my fellow passengers on the way to Travancore expressed it : "Christians together can love one another and witness among themselves, but as soon as they are among students outside the Church, they cannot make their witness effectively and courageously." Many seek to escape the problems of this world, but this cannot satisfy their deepest longings, and they keep on searching for some absolute

incentive. Then, tired of searching for the absolute, they accept the relative. They also consider politics to be relative and corrupt, but nevertheless they give it their whole devotion and complete confidence, because it provides a dynamic for our day and is relevant to the pressing needs. "Techniques and material progress will solve all our problems", is a commonly expressed belief.

In addition to all these problems, there remains for the Christian student the major and underlying question of why he should hold to his belief in Christ and his obligation to proclaim it, and his view that national birth and regeneration are in the first place dependent upon spiritual regeneration, even when these convictions seem to have no relevance to the problems of today's world.

## **In Colonial Africa**

BOLA IGE

(Nigeria)

It is difficult to talk of Africa and the problems of her peoples for many reasons. In size it is the second largest continent. Although most of its native inhabitants are dark-skinned and have black, woolly hair, they have different backgrounds and cultures. Moreover the political situation in the territories varies. The "scramble for Africa" which started in 1884 has had far-reaching effects on the vast continent, for good and for ill. Partition has resulted in differences in educational systems, which in turn have moulded the lives of students in diverse ways. So, whereas it is comparatively easy to talk about problems of students in Europe, America or India, it is a little difficult in relation to Colonial Africa, except as these are seen in their context and political perspective.

There are only a few university colleges in Colonial Africa, and most of them are very young. There is the Makerere College in Uganda; University College, Achimota, in the Gold Coast; Gordon College in Khartoum, and University College, Ibadan, Nigeria. The first three and the last were established only in 1948. Because of the scarcity of universities in Africa, every year colonial students flock to Europe and America for further studies. But we are concerned with the problems of students in the university colleges in Colonial Africa. These may be said to be political, economic, social or cultural, educational, and religious.

There is no running away from the fact that the first problem of every African colonial student is the answer to give to the ever-

recurring question: "Why are we not yet free?" That question may be said to be the sum-total of his grievances — justifiably or not. The student knows that the answer lies in active participation in politics. But he almost despairs when he considers many factors. In Africa it is generally agreed that only the rich and well-to-do, who can wield influence and attract attention with money, should enter politics. Politics is said to be a dirty game, and a student who has an apparently bright future in the government service must not soil his "reputation". He may have a scholarship of some sort — he must not lose it. The Government Secretariat has his personal file and can with a stroke of the pen withdraw his scholarship. Mere agitation in college may even cost him his career. In the face of such odds, the African colonial student is at a loss to know how to raise his voice against the many political and social injustices without being stigmatized or victimized.

Responsible government is very young in a few countries, and the students have not yet fully realized that a government run by an elected African majority is not likely to be the victimizing type. African students do want to demonstrate and protest against what they consider wrong, but they just cannot. And whenever they read of student protests in other parts of the free world, they heave a sigh and perhaps repress a curse. Some of the agonizing times of a student come when he reads that his brothers in America and in South Africa are being discriminated against because of their colour. He grows furious with anger, and wonders why God should visit his race with such a curse.

But he also has economic, social and cultural problems. As a student in a university college, especially where university colleges are a novelty, he is considered greatly privileged and a potential leader of his people. Some recognize that fact, and therefore struggle to find ways of keeping in close contact with the world outside the residential college. Others, well fed and with enough of everything, care little about the sufferings of their people. They find it difficult to make themselves agreeable and comfortable with other people. This is the greatest social problem in the young countries of Africa, because the student is finding himself isolated or, at best, enjoying life only when among other students.

In parts of Colonial Africa there are still differences in pay between whites and blacks, even if they have equal educational qualifications. The student knows that patriotism and good sense demand that work in the government service ought to be done by Africans. Most students begin to wonder how and why they "should bear their cross" mildly. If this problem is unsolved, the student often suffers



later from "spiritual depression" in the civil service. Isolated from the semi-literate or illiterate community because of his education, ill-treated in the government service because he is black, he does not know what his social status is.

Western civilization has had its impact on African ideas, and often there is a conflict in traditions and moral judgments. If a student lives the Western type of married life, he cuts his small family off from the larger family which is generally communal. To live a truly African family life, he may not be able to maintain his own family as his Western civilization would lead him to do, because he has far too many relatives to care for. What is he to do to satisfy his own family and the larger family? Freedom of association or "pairing", characteristic of Western males and females, is little liked or condoned by the older Africans. The African student is therefore at a loss to know how to reconcile the conflicts between the moral judgments and standards of the African and those of the Westerner.

The syllabuses in the university colleges are often based on the syllabuses of European universities. The African student who wants a degree at all costs may not care whether all his history is about Australia or England, and his geography about Siberia. But sometimes, especially when he is in difficulty, he asks whether the syllabuses should not have an African basis, whether it is sensible to ask him to appreciate Wordsworth's "The Daffodils" when he has never seen one! There is also the problem that few study for the sake of acquiring knowledge. This is so because most scholarships are granted for professions which bring material advantages to the country.

There is also the "get-rich-quick" mania which drives many Africans to English law schools; a craze for scientific studies like engineering and medicine; the inability and/or unwillingness of parents who are not really well-to-do to spend money on long courses, and the unemployment of and low salaries paid to those who study liberal arts. The African student therefore hesitates to study liberal arts, or philosophy or religion. And as for classics, he thinks that the dead languages are of no use to growing Africa.

The "rationalism" which pervades the atmosphere of the university or college conflicts with the religious ideas of Africans, all of whom believe in the existence of God. Perhaps the student is even told by Europeans that it is presumptuous of him to think that Christianity is better than any other religion. He foolishly tries to emulate his lecturers and professors, who are mostly agnostics or atheists, and he finds himself losing his hold on God. His new knowledge teaches him that God is not so important.

The problems facing students in colonial Africa are many and varied, and they have not been exhausted here. But all may be embodied in one major problem: how can the renascent African, with all his handicaps, run the race in a world which is going at such a fast speed of scientific progress? And the Christian asks further: what can Christianity do to and for all these students?

## **In Communist-dominated Countries — China**

PHILIP LEE-WOOLF

(Great Britain)

I ask you to remember that it is over two years since I left China and that in any case I cannot speak as a Chinese would.

It seems to me that there are certain similarities in the student situations in, for example, East Germany and China, but possibly the process as a whole and its result will be different, as its context is certainly different.

The revolution in China, which communists control, has grown out of a background of the preceding arbitrary and irresponsible government, out of the chaos which comes when the rich and powerful are lawless, out of the outraged self-respect of the unprivileged, for example, the millions of peasant women, who, though the wives of poor farmers, were nevertheless at the mercy of the village boss and landlord.

Students were in the dreadful dilemma of regarding themselves, as they had been for several generations, as the voice of the voiceless masses, and feeling themselves uprooted from the true soil of China. They were absorbing Western culture, a culture which had, mistakenly, thought itself capable of forming a new basis for unifying China, and becoming more and more remote from old Chinese ways. Many of them, being refugees during the war, had not seen their families for years. Many more, in spite of having gained some technical skill, were unemployed after graduating, and thus could not feel that they had a part in the renewal of national life.

Against this background, the revolution led by the communists promised order instead of chaos, an order directed towards national strength and a more human society; participation in national life, instead of the frustrations of unemployment and rootlessness; a sense of purpose and a coherent understanding of what is going on in the world. I believe it true that many students support the

revolution from patriotic and idealistic motives: they turned to it because they saw no other hope of fulfilling certain liberal ideals caught during their education. It may be that there will be conflict between such ideals and the actual program of the revolution, but if so the conflict is to them largely latent.

Christian students known to me — I cannot speak for other parts of China — found themselves in such various dilemmas. They shared the early hopes of the revolution, and were then forced to ask: "Is there in Christian faith no power which is *socially* revolutionary?" Before the deeds of the communists they had to ask: "Is there in Christianity no inherent unity of faith and practice?" Where membership in the official youth movement is almost essential to participation in constructive work, but "proselytism" is forbidden, they had to ask: "How can we share in the revolution and yet declare the Gospel?" Faced by the power of the comradeship of party and youth movement, they could not but ask: "Is there such a reality of fellowship in Christian love?"

The first challenge came, I think, in these moral and spiritual forms. The ideological challenge came second. But it came. And then it became urgent for Christian students to strengthen their grasp of basic Christian theology. Previously there had been little interest in such study; now there was a widespread demand for it. At the same time it became urgent to distinguish the content of faith from the Western cultural forms in which it had been received. This is a difficult and dangerous procedure. In an environment suddenly transformed, in an intellectual and spiritual country of which there are no maps, the Gospel has to be preached, loved and obeyed, in fresh ways, in spiritual travail, and in spite of fear of losing the substance of the old faith.

## **The Impact of Military Life**

· WILLIAM STRINGFELLOW

(United States)

What I have to say arises mostly from my personal experiences and observations during the past two years in the United States Army. My experiences were for four months as a basic trainee, then ten months as a supply specialist with an unusual personal contact and conversation with the men of my unit, followed by ten months in which I served as "troubleshooter" on morale problems among NATO

troops and during which I travelled to many units of the NATO Army to interpret the concept of North Atlantic defense.

What I want to say may betray to some too great an anxiety, but to me it does not indicate enough.

I say this against the background of American experience since the war and the moods through which that experience has passed: first that period of hope, immediately after the end of the war, when we demobilized not only our manpower and military machine but also our industrial plant, and when we launched great schemes of building and rebuilding — through the Marshall Plan, for example — which were evidence of our hope for peace. Some now call this our period of appeasement.

Then came a mood of doubt, some call it a time of awakening, symbolized especially in the Berlin blockade, by the fall of Czechoslovakian democracy, and by the failure to secure any effective international control of atomic power. It was the time when Americans began seriously to doubt that Soviet power shared any hope for peace.

Before long our doubt gave way to stark desperation, and hope for peace was all but abandoned. The Korean conflict transformed our doubts into fear of imminent world war. And we were desperate because we were unprepared — we had sincerely hoped for peace — and now our hope seemed betrayed, both without by the intentions of Soviet power and within by some of our own citizens. Somehow, Americans felt, we *must* have been betrayed: how else could these events have come to pass? But because we had a sense of desperation — and a terrible fear of immediate global war — this was the time when our resolution to resist and make sacrifices was remobilized.

But then nothing happened. A year after the Korean incident began, war had not come, and the Korean conflict itself became more and more an ambiguous encounter which seems never to approach an ending. Decisive possibilities — either militarily or in negotiations — for ending it apparently do not even exist. There is stalemate in Korea. And Americans now sense that this stalemate is but the most obvious sign of the stalemate which grips every frontier on which men struggle. Our sense of emergency has dwindled, because our emergency now is not so much a physical thing, and every other emergency which Americans have known has been associated with physical calamity. Some Americans are frustrated and disturbed because they live in stalemate, and others are just bored.

I was among the first group of civilians drafted after Korea, when the fear of imminent war was so great. We were prepared



for combat, combat that we were told might come at any moment. The training was rigorous and seriously intended, and we took it seriously and prepared ourselves physically and technically, and as well as a man can, personally, to fight.

Then we were transported thousands of miles from home to take up the positions which had been assigned to us. But the enemy that was to have marched across the zonal frontier, did not. And so we waited. The training continued, still seriously intended, but it became more and more difficult to take it seriously. Though the seriousness of the threat which required us to be there, and wait and train and wait, was emphasized with great regularity — even this was called into doubt. No one of us wanted to fight, but what purpose does a soldier have apart from fighting?

A man cannot remain for long in a situation in which he discerns no purpose, and so we found escapes — in the curiosity of life in a foreign country, in alcohol, with *frauleins*, in the lazy social mores of military life. But as these became recognized as escapes, and thus lost their utility, many men found a new escape in apathy — no, in much more than that: in a turning away from this situation without purpose and a turning inward, a preoccupation with self, and a repudiation of all concern or interest in work and problems of the world's life.

It was at this point that men began to realize that the situation without purpose in which they found themselves is not only in the NATO Army — or the awful prelude to actual combat — or just a problem in which they had become involved. It is not something temporary. This is something that will last for a long, long time.

A few men engaged themselves in speculation about what had caused this situation in which they could see no purpose, and to which they could see no conclusion, no decisive result towards which they could work and to which they might relate themselves. It was interesting, for a while, to analyse it as "cold war", or as the consequence of capitalist enterprise, or as the decadence of "Western culture", or as the derivative of ferment among subject peoples and races, or as the hour before atomic catastrophe. But most men came quickly to see that analysis in this sense is not personally important. What is important is to understand the personal significance of what they had come to realize. That was apparent enough: its significance for a man is in its instability.

A man cannot rely upon military power, because now if it is committed to combat it offers only destruction, and if it is not so committed it has no purpose.

A man cannot rely upon money, because circumstances beyond the control of money determine its value and use.

A man cannot rely upon the law, because now he can be cast out and disgraced without ever having committed a crime — anywhere in the world.

A man cannot rely upon the "American dream" of an ever-expanding, ever-ingenuous, ever-progressing society, because every expansion destroys as much as it produces, every ingenuity humiliates as much as it uplifts, every accomplishment of men is incomplete and insufficient.

A man cannot rely upon science, because it has already destroyed too many men, and now promises glibly to destroy even more.

A man cannot rely upon the intention of democracy, because man's own indignity always frustrates the democratic hope.

A man cannot rely upon a friend, because there is no stability in human personality.

A man cannot rely upon himself, because he is too bound up in institutions and activities which are unstable.

A man cannot rely upon the Church, because it has abandoned too many other men, and seems always to abandon God.

There is instability.

It is not new, but it is total — everywhere — and it is not going to end.

I believe that the realization of the total, compounded instability of life has come to many of those who have been in the NATO Army. This is not the only situation in contemporary American experience where such a realization has gripped men, but it is perhaps true that it grips a man more quickly and bluntly in the military service because the fact of stalemate, of being in a situation without purpose or without any clear decisive content, is more vivid there. And this is of grave importance, because for an indefinite time to come most American men will be going through the military experience, and their return to the civilian community can be expected to accelerate the realization of the instability which surrounds us among those who have remained at home.

The impact of this sense of instability in all things upon the individual is one which leads not simply to cynicism, a repudiation of participation in the community, and embitterment, but actually to a disintegration of personality — to a robbery of that upon which individual personality in America has so often depended for stability and purpose — and a replacement of that which has been robbed by an oppressive and overwhelming sense of personal helplessness.

I have said all this in order to make two points :

(1) if there is truth in this analysis, then it is of tremendous political significance, because this disintegrating impact upon personality will cause a constriction and paralysis of democratic institutions in America, and

(2) if Americans through this experience discover their own helplessness, they may hear also of their redemption in Christ.

## In French Universities

GEORGES CRESPIY

(France)

This does not claim to be a full description of the spiritual situation of European intellectuals or of the problems of students, even Christian students. He who would say, "This is the university of Europe", would prove that he has not understood.

*Nihilism in universities.* Nihilism comes from the Latin *nihil* meaning nothing. In its extreme form, which is never completely achieved, it seems to be the affirmation that in man as well as in the world and in God there is nothing which can be lived, to give meaning to life and some validity to human reality. This form of nihilism is a relatively new event, a sort of aggravation or exploitation up to the extreme limit of the logic of scepticism.

However, this nihilism which matured during the crises of the nineteenth century and which was expressed in the past in the will to political and social upheaval (the elimination of money, of the legal system, political authority, the family) was naive and full of hope and too concerned with aesthetics to be a real danger. The student of 1900 could be a nihilist in this sense, and then later on settle down comfortably to a bourgeois existence.

The new nihilism is of quite another character. It does not deny the value of any particular society ; it denies that human existence in general is of the slightest value. According to it man cannot live in order to achieve an harmonious society ; he lives from day to day, and to live is simply not to be dead yet.

*Causes of nihilism.* The assertion that war is the father of nihilism has no foundation. War has extended and hastened its success ; it has not created it. Historically it seems more probable that nihilism sprang from the disintegration of bourgeois culture, helped by the disintegration of humanist idealism.

The philosophical expression of nihilism (not its cause) is at the present time the thinking of Jean Paul Sartre. This thinking brings to light what seems to me to be the very root of "nihilism as lived", which is not being able to see men (and the world) in time. "Nihilism as lived" is characterized by the refusal to believe that history (of men and the world) is moving towards an end, has a direction and a meaning. On a more pragmatic plane, this refusal is ceaselessly nourished by the failure of contemporary society to control its own destiny. The world of men seems to be a world of dead men to whom respite has been granted.

From this results a form of sensitivity which affects more or less the mass of students and which can, by and large, be characterized as follows: the death of great political enthusiasms, the ironic (and often painful) refusal to believe in the key words of classical humanism — freedom, justice, democracy, and so forth; and finally, the will to restrict one's own hopes to the present or the immediate future, the search for a place in society, for comfort, and, on another plane, the priority given to techniques over knowledge.

It should be added that contrary to the pessimistic expectations of moralists, nihilism as an experience is no more immoral than bourgeois humanism as an experience. In a way, it is even less; in certain respects, it is pure.

In the realm of ideas, nihilism stands as the will to reject both the flabby Christianity of the nineteenth century and the progressive and strongly atheistic scientism of the same period. Nihilism is considered materialistic, but it must be specified that this materialism has a practical and not an ideological character. It rebels against the ideological pretensions made by classical materialisms to found the world and men on matter, just as it rejects the spiritualist claim (which it erroneously confuses with Christian faith) to found it upon "the spirit". This is why nihilism faces as its two major opponents the Christian faith and communism.

*Christian faith and communism confront nihilism.* Christian faith and communism both have a vision of history from which proceeds a vision of men, and are indeed alone in the modern world in having a coherent and clear message on this point. They derive different ethical systems from their assumptions, but both have the same quality of clarity. Also they are engaged in the same struggle to restore a meaning to the existence of modern man. But of course, in the universities, communists and Christians are both in a minority position and both active. They have a common adversary whom they approach in different ways according to their own techniques.



This is the only point on which they come together, and problems between them arise later.

### *Conclusion*

1. It is more than ever necessary that Christian thinking concern itself with the problem of the meaning of history. It is on this point that it can and must challenge both nihilism and communism.

2. In the student world particularly this must take the form of a refusal to surrender to the ease of the ghetto, where there is the danger of avoiding problems. Our message includes a conviction about the meaning of history, and this must find its expression in an ethic whose dominant note is joy.

3. No contact of any kind, even on the political plane, should be neglected, lest we give to the Christian faith the character of unreality of which others accuse it. A dialogue must be carried on wherever possible, after strenuous preparation through the common study of the foundations of the Christian faith.

4. Nihilism cannot be attacked with "devalued" words. The problem is whether we shall be able to build up Christian men and a Christian community in the heart of the university. Then the right words will come ; otherwise they will be wanting.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

*We are very happy to publish here two letters received by the editor, containing comments on the number of The Student World on "Man and Woman". Such letters are a real help to the editor and should be useful to readers of our magazine. We hope that through them it may be possible to start a fruitful dialogue on this important question.*

Dear Editor,

I have been reading with some interest the Second Quarter issue of *The Student World* dealing with the subject, "Man and Woman", and wonder if I may be permitted to make a few comments arising in my mind as a consequence. My general reaction to the articles, and thus, I presume, to the work of the Study-Chalet, is that within a limited sphere, creative and helpful thinking has been done. However, if the end result is to be regarded as a rather comprehensive discussion on "how men and women are to live together ..."

(editorial), then it would appear that there are several important unanswered questions still waiting to be raised.

At the outset, let me make clear that I do not apologize for outlining situations and raising problems without either supplying causes of the situation or solutions to it. In most cases I do not know these answers, and it is because of this ignorance, and the feeling that there may be others in the same position, that I turn to you and the other members of the Federation for guidance.

The predominant theme of the articles, as the editorial points out, is that "we must believe as men and women that God has given us to one another, not only for our joy and happiness, but as His chosen means for realizing the whole person", with the emphasis on the latter part of the statement. The problem arising, as I read the subsequent papers dealing with this, is that concerning the place of the large numbers of women (and perhaps men too) who, though they long to be married, are not.

I think it is true to say that for many years geneticists and wise biologists have been arguing as to whether there are or are not enough men to "go round", and usually it seems that the women are put in a fighting position. And there are some too who point to more recent events, such as two world wars in which hundreds of thousands of young men were killed, in order to account for the surplus of women. If in reality the picture now is a simple one in which there are too many women, then there is little to do apart from accepting the possibility that the supply of husbands will run out before your own place in the queue has been reached. Obviously, it is not as easy as this, and for the thinking person, and especially for the Christian, a much deeper aspect must be faced. One quick glance around most church congregations at the predominance of women reveals an immediate difficulty if young people desire their marriages to be from within the group of Christian people.

Some time ago, in an Australian university college, a group of women students and staff were discussing the question of marriage, and in the course of their talking, one of the older women, a spinster, affirmed that "any girl can get married, provided she is not too fussy". Although the remark at the time was made in a rather light-hearted fashion, there is a very real element of truth in it for our purposes. For the fact is that the very thing which has made a lot of girls "fussy" is their grasp of a Christian standard in these matters. What comfort then is it to such a one to read, "Man created in the image of God must not be alone . . . his true destiny is fulfilled in an encounter, and this encounter is marriage..." (p. 116), or else, "... only in the 'one flesh' union do they constitute the true

'image' of the triune God..." (p. 132), to know virtually that because she is not prepared to lower her standards and cheapen her conception of the nature of the love on which she, by the constraint of her faith, could base her marriage, or the sort of man with whom she can form it, she has every possibility of automatically preventing herself from fulfilling her "true destiny". It may be, of course, that this is all to be written off as the cost of obedient discipleship in this generation of moral laxity, but there seems to be a strange and bewildering contradiction at the centre of it, not exactly in line with our ideas of the ways of God's working. In fact, daring for a moment to play with theological dynamite, is it relevant to remember that Jesus Christ, whom, though Very God of Very God, we accept to be the revelation of true manhood, was yet not married?

Of recent years, we have had much talk on a Federation level and on a local and personal level about vocation, and in the course of that time I have met many women students whose only genuine desire is to be married and establish a home and family. In fact this would probably be the one held most commonly among women, although in an open discussion on vocations it is seldom mentioned. Consequently for these people, any job taken on as graduates must be one to put them where they are likely to meet a husband. Is this a worthy motive, and if so, where does it fit in with our idea of "calling"?

Some have said that if marriage does not come their way they will adopt children, and at least one has gone further and said that her desire to have a home and children of her own is so strong that if she is not married, she will be willing, provided it is legally permissible, to submit herself to artificial insemination. Make no mistake, she would be a perfect mother, and for my own part, I refuse to believe that the love surrounding her child born in this way would not be every bit as great as that from any normal Christian marriage. And yet, do we approve — and what of her "destiny" in the light of our present discussions?

Oftentimes it is not a matter of lowering standards, but a course of action taken as a result of certain existing circumstances; for example, there are those whose loyalty keeps them at home to care for ageing parents, if not indefinitely at least for that period of time when they are likely to marry. The position frequently arises — is she fulfilling her true destiny more truly by paying her debt for all the love showered on her by her parents when she was growing up, or by turning her back on them and living her own life as she pleases? I realize, of course, that the situations are rarely as clear cut as this, but the principle frequently remains the same.

Or let us consider those who are simply physically unattractive people, or those who, however well meaning, have few or no gifts of positive personality. Admittedly, there are not really many of these, but there are enough to constitute a problem — and many would not be satisfied with a glib pious answer pointing out that, after all, these factors are only superficial, and as long as our souls are as pure as the proverbial lily, our real worth will be revealed in time. From what we can gather of the ways of man, there is every possibility that by the time Right has triumphed, and eyes have been opened, senile decay will have set in to such an extent as to make the passage down the aisle a rather painful procedure! Let us face it honestly, if marriage is to be achieved, free social contact has to be made and these things largely determine it.

Lastly in this group of people, let us include those who have willingly chosen the way of celibate brotherhood or sisterhood. I have no wish to become involved in a heavy discussion about the pros and cons of this, but I should be keen to know whether these people have chosen this way, aware that they are thus contradicting the path God thinks is "good" for them, and taking a direction which will prevent their becoming "whole persons".

One last aspect of the question. We have looked at those who in the face of certain circumstances have chosen to remain unmarried, and earlier we looked at those who despite their choosing cannot achieve it. In this latter case, what of the consequences? Most people know of women, sometimes quite young, who are far too friendly with one another, because their desires for men friends have been unfulfilled — do we condemn this, or do we allow it, by way of "compensation"? Inherent in this, of course, is the whole question of the Christian demands in friendship — not necessarily between opposite sexes — a question we would probably do well to discuss more than we have.

Well, there it is, Mr. Editor, but lest in the course of writing I have lost my perspective, let me summarize my position. I realize that I have raised major issues, when talking about vocation, artificial insemination, a Christian's attitude to celibacy, and the like, but I trust I have not raised them to the detriment of the primary question in my mind — when such a drastic theological concept is placed before us, what do we say to the unmarried? I would not dare for a moment to dispute the wisdom and knowledge of those who have formulated it, but I cannot but wish that it were a little less dependent on external circumstances, frequently not of our own choosing. It is a thrilling and comforting idea for those who are married, but it must bring little of the joy usually associated



with the discovery and understanding of truth to those who are not. I may be too slow to change my ideas, for I cannot dismiss easily from my experience the conviction that the "image of God" I have seen in the lives of some of His children, though unmarried, is false, or at the best incomplete; nor can I learn quickly to change my conception of the encounter in which is worked out the true destiny of a man or a woman. Yes, I too believe that that is indeed an encounter, but I believe it is one involving no one but that man and his God, when alone and in all his nakedness, he comes face to face with Jesus Christ.

MARGARET FORD.

Dear Editor,

I shall be jumped on by the experts, because I write something which should be stated much better and more carefully than I either am capable of doing, or have the time to attempt. Nevertheless your issue of Second Quarter, 1952, was so unbalanced and no sign of protest from people more equipped than myself appears in the Third Quarter issue (arrived today), that I am compelled to hope that even a goat's bleat of protest may do something in the way of asking for some counterbalancing statement in your pages at an early date.

The main point is that you are an ecumenical magazine, and yet there was no word said, except incidentally on p. 124, about the unmarried state in its various manifestations. For clarification I divide this state into three:

1. Celibacy on religious grounds. Your writers might not have been aware that in Orthodox and Anglican catholicity there is a place for religious communities and orders; yet both these communions take part in ecumenical conversations, and might have expected something on celibacy in an ecumenical magazine.

2. Bachelorhood and spinsterhood, by personal choice or disposition (there is a distinction, I think) or from the demands of one's vocation. I think particularly of men and women in education who forego marriage.

3. What I must call, for want of a better phrase, enforced bachelor- or spinster-hood, due to family circumstances and/or responsibilities. This last may be given a religious interpretation by men and women of living faith, but it is also accepted on humanitarian grounds.

The day is long past when the unmarried could or should look down on the married state, as from a superior one. The celibate makes no exclusive claim to be living a higher life, or a "better" one than those who have opted for marriage. But the implication of a lot of the writing in the Second Quarter, 1952, is that the unmarried state is an abnormal or maybe sub-normal one. This was especially true of the article on "The Mystery of Marriage", where the theology (was it ?) "two equals one", and the exposition of the "eternal bond" theory, particularly in pages 160-162, seems as limited an interpretation of our Lord's saying concerning marriages in heaven as the writer himself accuses others of having held. On the practical level, if this theory is worked out, it is obviously wrong for a widower or widow to marry (and St. Paul did not go as far as that), on the grounds that they cannot have two eternal bonds in heaven. It also appears firmly to exclude from the life of heaven all those who have not married, on whatever laudable grounds they may have refrained, because they are incomplete people. This is unfortunate for those of us who have not entered into holy matrimony, and certainly calls for a radical revision of the calendar of Saints.

I don't want to say any more, nor to start a controversy. I am only giving little points as hints that something needs to be said on the other side, and therefore to plead very strongly that as soon as possible you should publish counterbalancing statements, and correct the misunderstandings which, when I was reading your issue, seemed quite likely to arise in many people's minds, and which would prevent any of them both by the implications and omissions of that issue, from ever contemplating celibacy as a possible vocation for either themselves or anyone else.

BRIAN HARVEY.

Dublin University Mission Brotherhood,  
Hazaribagh, Bihar, India.

## AN ASIAN TRAVEL DIARY

MARIE-JEANNE DE HALLER

The channel was cold and grey with the beginning of October, but we knew that we should soon have left it behind for the intense blue of the Mediterranean. After Gibraltar the sunset became slower and slower while the sky took more than an hour to change from rose to violet, then to orange and finally to green. It was during such an orgy of colours that after a week we arrived at Port Said to find ourselves assailed by swarms of little launches in all the animation of a southern shore. Their owners shouted one another down as they hawked their wares — the *pouffes* of many-coloured leather, the carpets with the inevitable sphinx and pyramids, the slippers and the handbags all with similar designs — objects on which the tourists pounced eagerly, trying their hand at the bargaining which is such an art in the East. In the main streets I came on groups of men in fez and turban discussing excitedly while the cafe loudspeakers blared forth music which sounded so strange to my European ears — it was difficult to realize that when I returned six months later they would make me feel homesick! Now and again a child or a veiled woman emerged from some dark passage to remind me of that closed world where the Egyptians, forgetting for a moment the front they put on for the traveller, are still themselves.

While our boat slipped silently through the Suez Canal in the starry night, I reflected how superficial travel is and how little opportunity for real contact and understanding it offers in a world where men show little true interest in the habits and ideas of the peoples whom they visit. Most travellers seem to be largely pre-occupied in buying things more cheaply at each port than at the last. But at this stage I had still to see the mobs in the bazaars at Aden...

The Suez Canal, that powder magazine in international relations, makes one think at one and the same time of aerial manœuvres and of the days of the captivity in Egypt. On the one hand jet planes screeched their way across the sky over military camps and hospitals. On the other, a few bedouins and their camels with supercilious air passed slowly into the desert as though defying the centuries. On the horizon heavy storm-clouds lay on the range of

Mount Sinai. Not much imagination was needed to picture to oneself the painful march of the Children of Israel through a hostile desert, the impression made upon their minds by Sinai and their receiving of the Ten Commandments. Little wonder that, parched with thirst as they were, they rebelled against a Moses who was leading them on into what must have seemed but a mad adventure!

Three days later Aden brought us back into the heart of the twentieth century — steep cliffs and always the line of the desert on the horizon, silvered this time with a string of petrol tanks. Another trouble-spot about which so many newspaper columns are written!

### *The East*

Once the Red Sea is behind, the East draws near. Each evening I climbed to the upper deck where there were no other lights, to gaze at the thousands of stars and to trace the line of the shooting stars as they lost themselves in the deep. It was at dawn that we reached Bombay, that magnificent natural harbor where one can still see passing to and fro the graceful sailing ships which from time immemorial have plied their trade with Arabia. The whole scene was bathed in tints of opal and mother of pearl. There was scarcely a ripple on the water. But it was not long before the sun banished all that was mysterious and beat with its pitiless rays on the red-bloused coolies who ran to and fro like busy ants, carrying on their heads or on their backs trunks and boxes which seemed twice as big as themselves. And so we had reached the world where the machine has not yet ousted manpower! I couldn't help asking myself how, in this overpopulated land, all these men would live should the system suddenly change! We had on board the former governor of Bombay and his wife, and an impressive delegation met them with the usual garlands of flowers, so that they left the boat trailing behind them an exquisite odor of jasmine.

The boat followed the western coast of India, passing every now and then graceful galleys with sails spread which reminded one of the pirate ships of long ago. The flying fish made tracks of silver as they leaped all round the boat as we drew near to Ceylon.

### *Ceylon*

Faithful to his post, Chandran Chinappa was there to welcome me to Colombo, and he conducted me through bewildering traffic to the bungalow of the Y.W.C.A. Rickshaws and ox carts competed with American cars of the latest model on the streets, everything



in a deafening noise of claxons. I had set foot in a world where the only uncontested law of traffic seemed to be "priority to him who makes the loudest noise"! The very crows joined their voices in the general cacophony as they swooped tirelessly about the city in their search for carrion. Here and there tall palm trees swung in the breeze, and from the little shops hung fruits of every colour, clusters of bananas, and coconuts still in their green or orange rind. (I had never realized that the coconuts we buy in the West are already peeled.)

After barely an hour of this I found myself in a family atmosphere. D. T. Niles was introducing me to the various members of the Y.W.C.A.; then we went on to lunch with Bryan de Kretzer, discussing my program as we went. I felt astonishingly more at home with all these people and on Asiatic soil than with the Europeans on my boat. The "ecumenical fellowship" is no meaningless phrase. All through my voyage I was to find myself happier with my Christian friends, new and old, in Ceylon, India and Burma, than with most of the Westerners I met out there.

At the very start I was plunged headlong into my initiation into local problems. On the very first evening I was astounded to find myself involved in a full ecclesiastical controversy about the doctrine — strange even to my Calvinist ears — of "Limited Atonement", and to discover that for some people this doctrine was the touchstone of true reformed theology. I was ashamed to learn that this conflict had almost reached the point of schism, provoked as it was directly by external pressure. I wondered whether we were going to reproduce all round the world our sterile quarrels, a scandal even in the West, or whether we would learn some day that the Church of Jesus Christ has something better to do. Was it really a *limited* atonement — even admitting that such a doctrine had a biblical foundation — that it was our task to preach in a world which is Buddhist, Muslim or Hindu and which knows nothing at all about our Lord and His saving grace?

### *Kandy*

The next morning the little train which was taking me to Kandy kept climbing up through the terraced paddy fields with their intense green against which stooping figures like silhouettes of polished black wood worked ceaselessly. The white oxen meanwhile stood patiently by awaiting the moment when the ploughshare would enter the dark earth. Here and there through the jungle I caught the gleam of the big brass jars which the women carried on their heads

with such graceful motion towards their cleverly-woven huts of palm leaves. I wished I could pause and learn more of the countryside. I wished I had some language in which to communicate with the country woman who sat opposite me and who was so obviously intrigued by my presence. Occasional gestures or smiles were the only means by which we could learn anything of each other, but that was all that was required for her to offer me some of her highly-seasoned curry which she carried neatly wrapped up in a banana leaf. In the same way she offered me a cup of that famous tea of Ceylon. This was not the only time I was to be treated with such kindness and generosity in the East.

The magnificent modern building of the University of Kandy, still unfinished, stands on one of the finest sites of the island. I wonder if the students will be able to adapt themselves to more modest conditions of life once they have left it. The S.C.M. at any rate is concerned not to lose contact with the world about it, and it is already discussing the need for "rural service squads" in the neighbourhood. We talked of this with Lakshman Pereira, one of the young professors at the university, who was also later to chair the World Conference of Christian Youth at Kottayam in December. Here as everywhere else in my wanderings many questions were asked about the conference, and the study outlines were eagerly discussed. The repercussions of such a meeting reach far more people than the delegates themselves. I trembled at the thought of our responsibility.

### *Jaffna*

There is nothing more delightful than to be in the company of "nationals" who love their country and want to make it known. I was initiated at a delightful supper party with the Niles in Colombo into the subtleties of coconut cookery in which Mrs. Niles excels. After it was over D. T. Niles conducted me to Jaffna at the far north of Ceylon. In one night of travel the luxuriant vegetation of the south gave place to the red and arid soil which already made one think of southern India. The very palm trees were different. Life is hard in the Tamil regions, but I reflected how deep man's attachment must be to a soil from which he must wrest a livelihood. I listened fascinated to my travelling companion's descriptions and almost wished the journey could be longer. My initiation continued apace. In two days I visited various schools and a group of church leaders in the region who were subjected to the hard trial of listening politely while I made my first essay in speaking to such an audience

—some of the groups stretched in age from university professors to children twelve years old. Happily at the end D.T. took pity upon me — or upon my victims — and spared me the sermon at an evening service in one of the colleges by taking it himself. In this way I was able to take part in a complete Tamil service in which I most impressed by the Indian hymns accompanied by one or two native instruments. These hymns rang so much more true on the lips of these children than any hymn of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival which unfortunately form the repertory of most of the churches, so that few Indian Christians are able to sing the praises of God in their own language. This fact was brought home to me when a librarian of an Indian university answered some remark of mine by saying in astonishment, "Do you mean to say that in Europe you sing hymns in other languages than English?" Just imagine what the reaction of a German would be to such a statement!

I also visited a village dispensary crowded with sick people and maternity cases in the most limited space (the woman doctor had brought six children into the world in the course of twenty-four hours). There was another missionary hospital in Jaffna on the most modern and splendid scale, which convinced me that it is never wise to generalize in a world where even the Christian enterprise takes such contrasting forms. The very primitive rubs shoulders with the very modern, and yet everywhere I found an element of charm in all relationships which was at once human and personal — and this is surely rare enough in our own model hospitals.

A rapid pilgrimage to Selvaretnam's ashram and a visit to the women's centre in Chunalcam gave me a glimpse of the effort at integration of the Christian witness in a rural community. I had the greatest difficulty in dragging myself away in order to catch the airplane which was to take me to India. At the customs, as a sort of symbol of a marvellous hospitality which had followed me wherever I went, I was offered a cup of coffee by the passport official who happened to be a friend of my companion. A servant put my cup down on the office desk where the passports were stamped and I drank my coffee with special respect, reflecting that it was certainly the first and last time that I would drink it in such circumstances. And yet the customs in Ceylon are supposed to be terrible!

*(To be continued.)*

## **BOOK REVIEWS**

VISION AND ACTION: THE PROBLEMS OF ECUMENISM, by L. A. Zander. Victor Gollancz, London. 18s.

It is significant that two of the most important works of ecumenical theology to have been published, this book and William Nicholls' *Ecumenism and Catholicity*, have both been dedicated to the W.S.C.F., which Professor Zander calls "the true spiritual advance-guard of ecumenism". *Vision and Action* is a book of which the Federation may well be proud, and in many ways it is a triumphant *apologia* for the fruitful participation over many years of the Russian S.C.M. in Exile in the life of the Federation. This is a book to be read and re-read, for it might be called the first systematic theology of the ecumenical movement. But it is not merely systematic; it abounds in vitality and is full of characteristic personal touches, like the story of the Orthodox and the Quakers discovering their "spiritual, intangible nearness" at Edinburgh in 1910. Many phrases and sentences will stick in the memory. "Rite may be regarded, so to speak, as clothing which a man can put on, take off, or change; or it may be compared to the human skin which cannot be discarded" (p. 163). "... the fundamental law of ecumenism which says: 'Persist in knocking at one door—believe that some other one shall be opened'" (p. 219). "In its essence ecumenism is not a movement, not an organization and not even an idea, but the manifestation of the one and holy Church" (p. 192). "When we see Christ in the forms characteristic of this or that Church, we see that Church in Christ" (p. 208). "Mystical unity is not an ultimate achievement, but a series of innumerable moments in the endless process of life. Every such moment has intrinsic value, and is an end in itself" (p. 221). It is difficult for a member of the Federation to read this book without feeling that "ecumenical experience", which can only be proved by personal testimony, and which yet is a presupposition of all ecumenical theology.

We must be grateful to Professor Zander for the orderly exposition of his first three chapters; for example, in his clear distinction of the ecumenic idea, the ecumenic moment and the ecumenic organization, and his isolation of the basic categories of ecumenical thought. (Here he covers ground very similar to that of William Nicholls' distinction between historical and eschatological unity.) The second



chapter gives an extremely useful analysis of different types of attitude to ecumenical matters and establishes the need for "confessionalism" as against "interconfessionalism" — a field in which the Federation was the pioneer. Chapter three analyses the problems of ecumenism, and it is interesting to find how Professor Zander, in examining "the still existent unity", anticipates the stress of the Lund Conference on the common possession of the Christian name, of baptism, and of destiny (eschatological hope). His analysis of "the lost unity" makes salutary reading for Protestants, who often underrate the difficulties of theological unity, or else ignore such cardinal Orthodox doctrines as mariology, hagiology and iconology.

For Professor Zander the centre of the ecumenical movement is to be found in the mutual recognition of each other as Christians by those of different traditions: he is kind to "heretics", wishing to see some at least of the marks of the Church among them, and this leads him to his conceptions of "churchiness", of which there may be varying degrees. (Would not "churchliness" have been a better translation?) The ultimate end of the ecumenical movement will be the reunion of East and West, but this is beyond the bounds of history: meantime, we can to some extent have an eschatological anticipation of the fruits of unity in the fellowship of the ecumenical movement.

A Protestant reviewer may be allowed to make several criticisms. It would seem that Professor Zander greatly underestimates what has undoubtedly been *the* most characteristic feature of Protestantism for the past one hundred and fifty years, namely, the missionary movement. His remarks on the difference between mission and proselytizing on page 117 do not take account of the Protestant belief that a church which is not missionary is not a church and has no claim to be called "apostolic". Thus he omits a critique of various recent documents on the theme of mission and unity, which are certainly in the centre of current ecumenical discussion. As a result of this neglect, he tends also to underestimate the vital importance of "the younger churches". Thus, while he is no doubt right in saying that Protestants should not imagine that mere reunions among themselves are of vital ecumenical significance, he is surely wrong in minimizing the significance of the Church of South India (p. 168 ff). There is perhaps a tendency here to be too ready to take refuge in eschatology: on the one hand the Church will be reunited in God's time — but no man will see it; on the other hand, we can enjoy "anticipation" of it now by ecumenical experiences. The whole conception of the ontological reality underlying this "eschatological anticipation" (so common in the Lund discussions,

where it is applied, for example, to intercommunion by Professor T. F. Torrance) must be gone into very thoroughly. Eschatology is liable to provide a refuge for those who do not really want to see a united Church this side of the End. It is not true in the ecumenical movement that "to travel hopefully is better than to arrive" — or it should not be. Thus, despite the fine sentence (p. 156), "Representatives of different churches... must, when praying together for Church Unity, completely renounce their confessional ideals, leave everything in God's hands and pray for that which we cannot imagine or conceive", one wonders to what extent a united Church is envisaged which would differ from Orthodoxy, and to what extent the author would recognize the soundness of any practical steps which were taken to achieve such unity. How, for instance, would he regard Oliver Tomkins' statement at Lund, "By entering into this relationship with each other we have already willed the death of our denominations"?

It is a fine thing and virtually a new thing in theology, to recognize a *tota Christianitas* in divided Christendom. But is "unity without union" (p. 217) enough?

It is a pity that a book which is so well translated should be marred by an unusual number of misprints, and it is hard to know why the Archbishop of Armagh's article in one of the Amsterdam volumes should be referred to in French rather than English (p. 194). There is an excellent table of contents, but an index would have been useful, and the long chapters might well have been subdivided for the benefit of English readers. The Federation will gratefully and affectionately acknowledge that this "voice of the minority" *has* helped "the young generation to think over and understand the hard and responsible problems of ecumenism".

R. H. S. BOYD.

THE COURAGE TO BE, by Paul Tillich. Yale University Press.

Delivered at Yale, these lectures on the Terry Foundation are a good sampling of Tillich's massive systematic theology. They show his method of "correlation" of the questions implied in contemporary human existence with the answers given by the final revelation in Jesus the Christ. As usual he is too compressed to summarize. Whole passages are illuminating, overflowing with insight, often "transparent" to the final revelation itself. As a philosopher's theologian and a theologian's philosopher, Tillich is supreme. One might wish for simpler terminology or more frequent use of biblical

language, but the words are not so much complex as heavily charged with meaning, and their implicit biblical and Christological content are equally powerful. Never easy, he is always rewarding. What follows is not so much summary or review, but rather a few glimpses, chiefly in his own words, of his main points stripped of his profoundly erudite illustrations from the whole sweep of Western culture.

What is the source of man's courage to be in an age of despair? As always Tillich engages in a two-fisted encounter with the given facts, the facts of life and the facts of revelation. All existence is threatened by despair and is by definition finite, guilty, meaningless. The threat of non-being belongs to existence. The threat is three-fold, but each of the three chief periods in Western civilization has, in its dissolution, been dominated by one of them: the threat of fate and death (ontic anxiety — classical period); the threat of guilt and condemnation (moral anxiety — medieval period), and the threat of doubt and meaninglessness (spiritual anxiety — modern period). The courage to be is an ethical act of self-affirmation in spite of the threats of non-being. He who is incapable of a powerful act of self-affirmation will be forced into a weak and reduced self-affirmation — of something less than his own potential being. One cannot avoid the question of being; even retreat is a form of self-affirmation. The question is, from whence comes the courage to be?

Courage must be considered ontologically in order to be understood ethically. It is rooted in the whole of human existence and ultimately in the structure of being itself. Courage does not remove anxiety, for anxiety is part of life and can only be accepted. Courage is self-affirmation in spite of non-being and anxiety. To be finite is to be threatened; it is to ask questions of existence and not to receive the answers. To be a creature includes both the heritage of non-being and of being, of anxiety and of courage.

Tillich writes of the courage to be as a part of a larger whole (all forms of collectivism, ideologies<sup>1</sup>, communityism), and of courage to be as an individual self (ending in existentialism). The former risks loss of self in collectivism, and the latter loss of one's world in pure existentialism. The risk must be taken. But as a matter of fact, to accept the anxieties of non-being, either as part of an embracing whole, or in one's individual selfhood, is possible only in the power of being-itself (God), who is greater than either the power of oneself or one's world. It is to be grasped by being-itself. To cease to have confidence in oneself or anything finite — to accept

<sup>1</sup> See especially his comments on the remaining role of democratic conformism in North America.

the meaninglessness, doubt, guilt, despair of existence — this is to be driven to a source of courage to be which transcends the threat of loss of oneself or of one's world. A third form of courage to be arises out of acceptance of the fact that we are carried by the creative power of being-itself, like every other creature.

This is the centre of the Protestant's courage to be — the courage to accept acceptance in spite of our consciousness of guilt. "He who is unacceptable is accepted" (in the light of divine forgiveness). The acceptance of acceptance is the basis of participation in the judging and transforming communion with God. Thus the courage to be is an expression of faith and faith is understood through courage to be. It is the power of being-itself which effects self-affirmation "in spite of" anxiety, and faith is the expression of this power. Faith bridges the infinite gap between us and God by accepting the *fact* that, in spite of the gap, the power of being is present. God is at hand. Out of the "in spite of" of faith the "in spite of" of courage is born. Faith is the state of being grasped by God, and he who is grasped is able to affirm himself because he knows that he is affirmed by the power of being-itself.

In our modern period the chief threat to being, the chief anxiety, is that of doubt and meaninglessness, the fear of losing the meaning of one's existence. A courage to conquer such anxiety must be able to live together with doubt and meaninglessness; it cannot dodge or explain them away. But to accept them, to take them into oneself, is faith, and includes an experience of the power of acceptance. The courage of despair, the acceptance of despair, is in itself faith and on the boundary line of the courage to be. For it is only because being-itself has the character of self-affirmation in spite of non-being, that courage is possible. Courage participates in the self-affirmation of being-itself. He who receives this power in an act of mystical or personal or absolute faith is aware of the source of his courage to be. Even if unaware of it, it works in him as long as he maintains the courage to take his anxiety upon himself. In the act of courage to be, the power of being is effective in us.

Not argument but the courage to be reveals the true nature of being-itself. There are no valid arguments for the "existence" of God, but there are acts of courage in which we affirm the power of being, whether we know it or not. And if the self participates in the power of being-itself, it receives itself back.

In simpler language, to say "yes" to life is not enough. But to say "yes" to one who says "yes" to us in our very despair, doubt, unbelief and guilt, this is the source of the courage to be. It is the courage of acceptance of the fact that God accepts us and wants us,



for Himself and for others and in spite of everything. The Christology which defines Tillich's thesis in these lectures must be sought elsewhere in the systematic theology. In the concluding pages of this book he simply refers to the Church which under the Cross alone can mediate a courage which takes doubt and meaninglessness into itself, "the Church which preaches the Crucified who cried to God who remained his God after the God of confidence had left him in the dark of doubt and meaninglessness. To be as a part in such a church is to receive a courage to be in which one cannot lose one's self and in which one receives one's world."

His concluding sentence must surely apply to many of us: "The courage to be is rooted in the God who appears when God has disappeared in the anxiety of doubt."

ROBERT B. TILLMAN.

D. H. LAWRENCE AND HUMAN EXISTENCE, by Father William Tiverton. Rockliff, London.

The theological interpretation of literature is a perilous business, even where the writer's philosophy is directly affiliated to a religious tradition. The case of D. H. Lawrence is of exceptional difficulty, and yet most books about him, from every kind of standpoint, give more place to his personality and his interpretation of life than to his art. Father Tiverton intends to avoid this peril; he takes Lawrence's art seriously, indeed to my mind a shade too seriously. I believe that Lawrence will be remembered for his letters, a few of his poems, some of his short stories and fugitive papers, and *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, rather than for his more ambitious novels. As T. S. Eliot says in the foreword to this book: "To me, also, he seems often to write very badly; but to be a writer who had to write often badly in order to write sometimes well." Father Tiverton says of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*: "As a story in the 'realist' tradition it is merely dull... But read as a great symbolic drama, with a vast religious theme supported by its own ritual and liturgy, it is very powerful." He also says: "It is interesting that to some critics at least, the third and published draft is much more self-conscious and artificial than the first draft." He agrees with these critics, but does not draw the inference that in this case repeated rewriting is a symptom of Lawrence's own sense of artistic failure. An overestimate of Lawrence as a successful artist, which he shares with Leavis, weakens the validity of an otherwise interesting and stimulating discussion of his religious outlook.

Where Father Tiverton, who is like myself an Anglican religious, would suggest that "at times in his writings Lawrence is trying (so to speak) to make up for leeway lost in his shielded Nonconformist upbringing", reversing a wrong emphasis "in the balance of Christian teaching", "re-emphasizing an element in the doctrine of Creation", I would say that he was trying, with very imperfect success, to recover something that was lost when Western Europe was Christianized, an element that was left out in the integration of pagan natural religion with Christianity, at least in the Catholic and Protestant West, perhaps not so completely lost in the Orthodox East, in Greece and Russia. Lawrence was, as he often said, "a passionately religious man", but of the kind who would prefer a pagan natural religion, of fertility, magic, and power, to Buddhism or Christianity. He had inklings of the sense of spiritual vitality that he did see and feel in Mexican Indians, in the Tyrol, in parts of the Italian countryside, and in one Russian writer, Rozanov. But he thought this was bound up with the survival of something pre-Christian, and in these particular instances he was not so very far wrong. So he tried to make a religion, a ritual, a liturgy, and a magic, out of mysterious impulses in us that find many means of expression. In his violent detestation of the slightest impulse to unnatural vice, and in his glorification of some kinds of natural love, he is not writing about sex, but using it to symbolize something else.

Here he sets a real problem to Christians which only they can answer, if there is an answer in this fallen world. But the problem seems to me to be set much better in *A propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*, which Father Tiverton rightly quotes at considerable length, than in the novel itself. The failure of the novel is itself an indication of Lawrence's failure to find his own solution.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

ECUMENICAL FOUNDATIONS — A HISTORY OF THE INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL AND ITS NINETEENTH CENTURY FOUNDATIONS, by William Richey Hogg. Harper and Brothers, New York.

In recent years there has been much discussion in national Student Christian Movements about the place of the missionary obligation in the general pattern of the S.C.M.'s work. This in turn has led many of us to take down our history books and read the exciting accounts of how student evangelism and recruiting for missions went hand in hand, reinforcing one another, in the time at the end

of the last century when the W.S.C.F. was unborn and full-time student evangelists were still pioneers. Dr. Hogg's book gives another view, from a different vantage point, of these familiar events, and places them in a wider context, as he traces the development of the movements in the nineteenth century which produced the International Missionary Council in the twentieth, and recounts the achievements of the Council up to its meeting at Oegstgeest in 1948.

Those of us who do not have a very clear idea about what the I.M.C. does, may well feel a little justified, as we read its history and note the extent to which it has remained a servant (as well as a generator) of groups and movements which have been more before the public eye than it has itself. Working in modest offices with (comparative to other world organizations) a small staff and budget (the amount of money which maintained orphaned missions throughout the world in the second world war was no more than would have purchased two B36 bombers in 1950), it has exerted an influence on churches, missions and governments out of all proportion to its outward pretensions. It has stood fast on the "Hague Principle" formulated in 1913: "... the only bodies entitled to determine missionary policy are the Home Board, the Missions and the Churches concerned" (p. 161), and it has lived and grown by sheer virtue of the integrity and worth of its counsel and on planning which was bold, yet not so bold as to be rejected by its constituent bodies.

One of the most illuminating sections is that in which Dr. Hogg outlines the considerations affecting the decision in 1947-48 that the I.M.C. and the World Council of Churches should continue to work "in association with" one another, but maintaining their autonomy. It gives a clear idea of the enormous achievement of the I.M.C. in drawing together for practical cooperation Christian bodies of widely differing structure and outlook, an achievement which was seen in its proper light by the Oxford meeting in 1923 when it said, "Our differences in doctrine, great though in some instances they are, have not hindered us from profitable cooperation in counsel. When we have gathered together, we have experienced a growing unity among ourselves in which we recognize the influence of the Holy Spirit" (p. 217). It was an urgent need for cooperation in practical tasks, notably in the representation of mission interests, first before colonial governments and then between warring nations, which accelerated the initial process of drawing together; but one's heart thrills with those who attended meetings for consultation, some very small, some large, from the early part of the nineteenth century onwards, when they discovered not only that they could work



together profitably, but that in working together they found, often to their surprise, a joyful unity which set their minds and spirits tingling, "an inward unity demanding vigorous concern for outward unity" (p. 24).

Space permits no more than a summary enumeration of a number of points which catch the interest :

- the important and often forgotten preparatory role of German missionary societies in cooperative activities in the nineteenth century ;

- the momentous entry of the Anglican Church into the Edinburgh Conference in 1910, where an Anglo-Catholic Bishop described himself as a "lion in a veritable den of Daniels" ;

- the part played by the Student Movement — "the S.C.M. made Edinburgh not simply a gathering of like-minded Christians, but a truly representative assembly" (p. 16) ;

- the "arrival" of the younger churches. It is only ninety years since a missionary conference in England declared in a resolution on the role of the European missionary as an instructor : "The higher Christian civilization from which he comes, his position as a messenger of a foreign Church, as a man of superior social rank, and as one of a dominant race, render him unfit to be merely their pastor" (p. 40). At Jerusalem in 1928, fifty per cent of those present came from indigenous churches, and secularism was recognized as the enemy of the Church equally in East and West ;

- the sad divisions between Continentals and Anglo-Saxons after the 1914-18 war, whose healing was triumphantly sealed in the magnificent Orphaned Missions program of the second world war. In the senescence of the League of Nations the world Christian community drew together and a global war did not break it again ;

- the remarkable success with which missionary freedom was defended ;

- the thorough and enterprising study programs which provide a wealth of material on a diversity of subjects : religious liberty, industrialism in undeveloped areas, narcotics, mandated territories, to name only a few ;

- the far-reaching influence of missionary cooperation on the development of the whole modern ecumenical movement.

Dr. Hogg's book was presented originally as a dissertation for a degree in Yale University, and one wonders whether this may account for a certain sobriety in style ; to apply such a criterion is perhaps, however, asking too much altogether. Dr. Hogg has



covered one hundred and fifty years of history in four hundred pages with admirable attention to detail, and at the same time one is left with an unmistakable impression of the pattern of events he desires to describe. The work is splendidly documented, from Continental as well as Anglo-Saxon and "younger church" sources, and there are three hundred books detailed in the bibliography.

*Ecumenical Foundations* is a gateway into the exciting history of one of the greatest aspects of the life of the Church in our time. It cannot be left aside for "those interested in missions"; indeed, reading it is an excellent corrective to the attitude which tries to label "ecumenism", "missions" and "Federation concerns" and put them into separate pigeon-holes. It leaves us in no doubt that the I.M.C. and the W.S.C.F. share a common heritage. Those who are eager that the Federation should be true to its past, and at the same time bear a full-orbed and expanding witness in the present and future, should read it.

LEILA GILES.